

CHRISTIAN WITNESS AND THE JEWISH PEOPLE

THE REPORT OF A CONSULTATION HELD
UNDER THE AUSPICES OF
THE LUTHERAN WORLD FEDERATION
DEPARTMENT OF STUDIES

2ND EDITION 1977

OSLO, AUGUST 1975

CHRISTIAN WITNESS AND THE JEWISH PEOPLE

The Report of a Consultation Held under the Auspices
of the Lutheran World Federation, Department of Studies

Oslo, August 1975

2nd edition 1977

Edited by Arne Sovik
for the Department of Studies
Lutheran World Federation
1976

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
Introduction, by Arne Sovik	1
Report of the Consultation	2
Preparatory Papers	
KERYGMA AND MARTYRIA IN THE NEW TESTAMENT by Prof. Dr. Christoph Burchard	10
INFLUENCES WHICH HAVE AFFECTED OUR UNDERSTANDING OF THE JEWISH PEOPLE THROUGHOUT THE HISTORY OF THE CHURCH by Prof. Harold H. Ditmanson	26
NO OTHER NAME by Dean Magne Saebø	40
IN NO OTHER NAME by Dean Krister Stendahl	46
THE UNITY/UNICITY OF GOD by Dr. Jukka Thurén	54
List of Participants	69
Appendix	
Jews in the North by Oskar Mendelsohn	70

Introduction

The papers that follow were prepared for a consultation held in Oslo, Norway, in late August 1975, under the sponsorship of the Department of Studies of the Lutheran World Federation.

The Oslo Consultation was the third general consultation on the subject of the Church and the Jewish People held under LWF sponsorship. At Løgumkloster, Denmark, in 1964 some forty theologians and mission leaders made a first attempt at an international Lutheran conference to discover what might be the special responsibilities that Lutherans might have toward the Jewish people, what solutions might be suggested for the exegetical and theological problems that burden our understanding of Christian-Jewish relations, and what our churches might do to divest themselves of the elements of anti-semitism that have, to our shame, been present among Lutherans ever since the Reformation. A small group continued to work until 1969 on the theological issues and produced a short paper for the Assembly of 1970.

A second meeting was called in Neuendettelsau, German Federal Republic, in 1973, more to assess the developments in the last decade and ask question for the future than to deal with specific issues. It was clear to all who were there, as it must be clear to anyone who has read material on the subject, that Lutherans are by no means of one mind when it comes to an understanding of Christian-Jewish relations, not least as concerns the Christian witness. The reasons for this diversity are historical and cultural as well as theological. The grounds for the last of these lie ultimately in the difficulty of interpreting Scripture. They focus both on the cryptic passages in Romans 9-11 and on the meaning of the New Testament claims for the finality of Jesus.

It seemed good therefore to a group which was considering what steps ought next to be taken within Lutheranism to move toward greater common understanding that the first problem for us should not be an attempt to deal with the urgent and practical issues of the Middle East and the place of Israel in the modern world. Rather there should be an attempt to deal exegetically and theologically with the scriptural testimony, acknowledging the fact that Scripture is interpreted under the influence of historical exigencies. The ultimate choice of theme and the procedures of the Oslo Consultation need not be dealt with here since they are treated briefly in the Report.

We here express our gratitude to the scholars who prepared the papers, and then revised them for publication here. Some were prepared in German, and we accept responsibility for any inadequacies of translation. It is to our regret that an illuminating and scholarly paper on the history of Jewish life in the Nordic countries, which was presented by Dr. Oskar Mendelssohn, a leader of the Oslo Jewish community, could not be included.

Thanks are also due to Mr. M.L. Kretzmann, whose health made it impossible for him to participate in a consultation for which he had done the initial preparatory work, and to Dr. Paul Opsahl, whose level-headed chairmanship gave both freedom and purposiveness to the discussions.

Arne Sovik
Geneva, Spring 1976

CHRISTIAN WITNESS AND THE JEWISH PEOPLE

The Report of a Consultation Held under the Auspices of
the Lutheran World Federation, Department of Studies

Oslo, August 1975

From August 25-30, 1975, at the Voksenasen Conference Center in Oslo, Norway, thirty persons gathered to discuss "The Oneness of God and the Uniqueness of Christ: Christian Witness and the Jewish People." This was the third international consultation on The Church and the Jewish People convened under the auspices of the Lutheran World Federation. The following statement will be most fully understood when studied in light of the earlier deliberations: Løgumkloster, Denmark (1964) together with a subsequent committee report (1969) and Neuendettelsau, Germany (1973).¹

From a broad selection of issues requiring further study (which had been developed in Neuendettelsau) a preparatory committee had chosen one in which there was known to be considerable disagreement among Lutherans, namely, the nature of the Christian conversation with the Jewish people. Do our common faith in One God, our common heritage in the Old Testament, the Christian recognition that a special place is accorded Israel in the New Testament as in the Old, and the long and problematic history of Christian-Jewish relations require that Christians' conversation with Jews and witness to them be in some way "special"? If so, in what way, theologically and practically? The theme of the Oslo Consultation and its subject matter were developed with this problem in mind. It was seen as primarily a matter of biblical interpretation and application. Its treatment could obviously have important implications for all our thinking about Christian mission.

In preparation for discussion a number of papers were presented, some in thetic form. Professor Harold Dittmanson, Northfield, Minnesota, USA, dealt with influences which have affected our understanding of the Jewish people throughout the history of the church. Dr. Jukka Thuren, Turku, Finland, discussed the oneness of God as seen in both Old and New Testaments. Dean Magne Saebø, Oslo, Norway, and Dean Krister Stendahl, Cambridge, Massachusetts, USA, approached the topic, "No Other Name" (Acts 4:12), from the standpoints of the Old and New Testaments respectively. Professor Christoph Burchard, Heidelberg, Germany, examined the concepts of proclamation and witness (kerygma and martyria) in the New Testament. (The texts of most of these papers are available on request, in German or English.)

Group Bible studies on passages relating to the biblical papers preceded each of those presentations. The latter half of the week was devoted chiefly to work in three groups from which the basic content of the following statement emerged. Each portion of this report was discussed, redrafted, and then accepted at the concluding plenary session.

Significant personal and informational exchange occurred during one evening session when several members of the Oslo Jewish community met with consultation participants. Dr. Oskar Mendelssohn, author of a history of the Jews in Norway, presented a paper on the Jewish experience in the Nordic countries. Further conversation led to a frank discussion of such issues as mission and dialogue, and the place and image of Jews and Judaism in Christian teaching.

Consultation participants are aware that there are a number of critical contemporary questions which this report does not address, or address as thoroughly

as some might have hoped. In certain instances this was because these questions fell outside the purview of this consultation's thematic focus. On other matters, differing views among participants could not be resolved within the time framework of the meeting.

Early in the consultation, however, one participant drew attention to an old axiom for good homiletics: we are not so much responsible for what we say, or what we think we say, but what we are heard to say. It is to be hoped that this report conveys to all readers the capacity to regard Jewish people with high honor, love, and a sense of eschatological wonder, as well as bear a clear witness to the name and honor of Jesus Christ, and the centrality of his crucifixion and resurrection.

This report is presented to the Commission on Studies of the LWF. The statement of the consultation does not speak for the Lutheran World Federation. Rather, it speaks to the Federation; it expresses the mind of a group of Lutherans assembled under LWF auspices to deliberate on a theme, and reports back to that body. In consequence of the strong conviction of the consultation that unless the study programs of the Federation "have some practical consequences on regional and local levels, the studies will have been made in vain", this document is also being sent to LWF member churches with the request that it be studied, reflected upon and acted upon as the nature of the situation requires.

Participants in the consultation would not let it go unnoticed if we failed to include in this report expression of their appreciation to those whose efforts made the consultation a possibility and a pleasure: The Norwegian Israel Mission, local host, secretaries, stewards, interpreters, the Voksenasen staff and representatives of the Church of Norway. Costs were met in part by grants from the USA, Canadian and German National Committees of the LWF and from the Norwegian Israel Mission.

Paul D. Opsahl, Chairman
Division of Theological Studies
Lutheran Council in the U.S.A.

Arne Sovik, Staff
Department of Studies
Lutheran World Federation

STATEMENT OF THE CONSULTATION

THE ONENESS OF GOD AND THE UNIQUENESS OF CHRIST:
CHRISTIAN WITNESS AND THE JEWISH PEOPLE

I. THE ONENESS OF GOD AND THE UNIQUENESS OF CHRIST

A. THE ONENESS OF GOD

When we as Christians speak about God we refer to the God to whom Holy Scripture bears witness. He revealed himself to His chosen people of Israel, and we are indebted to them for this witness. The conviction that God is one, claiming exclusive allegiance, matured in them from the beginning and they held to it through many periods of danger and suffering. In this, Israel was always different from the other nations, who acknowledged and worshipped a number of gods.

Together with the Jews, we confess the one God. The fundamental Jewish confession of faith, the Shema Yisrael ("Hear, O Israel, the Lord our God is one Lord" Deuteronomy 6:4), is the obvious background of the Christian creed. We also share the Jews' faith in God's creative power over the whole world and in His will to save all mankind as attested in the Old Testament.

B. THE UNIQUENESS OF CHRIST

Christians make these statements only in conjunction with the affirmation that for them faith in the one God is indissolubly linked with confessing the uniqueness of Jesus Christ. Thus they witness to and call upon the one God as the Father of Jesus Christ.

The conviction of the first Christians that the final realization of the Kingdom of God had begun in Jesus Christ was grounded in and strengthened by encounter with the risen Christ. That the crucified one is the Messiah through whom came salvation and redemption has always remained basic to the Christian faith and was exuberantly expressed in the statement of the early church: "And there is salvation in no one else, for there is no other name under heaven given among men by which we must be saved" (Acts 4:12).

In this conviction, Christians began to discover and read the Scriptures in a new way. A variety of Old Testament affirmations on the way of salvation were brought into focus and related directly to Jesus in the attempt to describe the experience of his uniqueness. They thereby confessed Jesus as the way to the Father for all mankind, both Jews and Gentiles.

C. JUDAISM AND CHRISTIANITY: A MUTUAL CHALLENGE

This statement of faith marked the parting of the ways for Jews and Christians. However, a relationship between Judaism and the church still remains. The fact that both move forward from the same Old Testament starting-point is a constant reciprocal challenge for Christians and Jews.

Paul was concerned with the special relationship between Christians and Jews in his letter to the Romans. Chapters 9-11 bear witness to his grappling with this question. He emphasizes that God has not disowned his people. He warns the Gentile Christians against arrogance vis-à-vis the Jews, and expects a final gathering of all those who belong to God.

In the post-biblical age the Christian doctrine of the triune God and the true humanity and divinity of Christ was developed on the basis of the rich store of New Testament statements about the uniqueness of Jesus Christ. This doctrine is meant to express and preserve faith in the one God in light of the overwhelming experience of the uniqueness of Jesus Christ and the power of the Holy Spirit. Hence the Nicene Creed opens with the words, "We believe in one God..."

But this doctrine has not always protected us against misunderstandings. For example, the experience of the uniqueness of Jesus Christ and the concentration of all statements of faith on him have not infrequently resulted in giving all attention to Jesus, thus tending to eclipse God. His will to be the way to the Father is thereby obscured, as is also his will to return his kingdom to the Father at the end (I Corinthians 15:24-28).

The existence of Judaism poses a continuing question as to whether we as Christians keep our faith in the one God. Christian-Jewish conversation can help to avoid imprecise speech about God. This is important for all Christian language about Him.

When Jews concern themselves with Jesus, he is seen as a man. This can help us as Christians to take Jesus' humanity completely seriously. In Judaism particular importance is attached to the obedience which is realized in just actions. Judaism thus reminds Christianity that the one God wants our witness to Him not only in word, but also in deed.

II. CHRISTIAN WITNESS

A. THE NATURE OF CHRISTIAN WITNESS

Christians need to remember that their witness to the Jewish people is but part and parcel of their witness to all people. There has sometimes been the misperception that Jews are to be isolated in a class by themselves, and then either singled out for exclusive missionary attention or excluded from Christian mission altogether. But this would assume that Jews are qualitatively different from ourselves, and furthermore that it is something about ourselves - perhaps that we are the have's and others are the have-not's - that generates Christian witness. That would be to forget that Christian witness, whether to Judaism or to anyone else, is God's mission and not our own. Christians, no less than others, are sinners and share in the common crisis of all mankind under divine judgment. "We are beggars," said Luther, and all we have is pure gift.

Christians have always been witnessing to their faith. "As the Father sent me, so I send you" (John 22:21). But what that very sending reminds us is that salvation in Christ is an action of God embracing all mankind. It is God who saves the world. The Christians through their witness only share the benefits of this salvation and the good news about it. They know that in Christ Jesus God has already deeded these gifts to all mankind, and not only to those who happen already to be enjoying them.

B. CHRISTIAN WITNESS AND THE JEWISH PEOPLE

The Christian witness is directed toward all our fellowmen, including the Jewish people. In witnessing to Jews, however, we must be mindful of the unique historical and spiritual relationship we have with them, both in continuity and discontinuity.

Among Jewish people, no Christian witness would suffice which does not gratefully affirm and live out what they and we have in common. Yet it is that very continuity between us which intensifies the discontinuity. To minimize this unique discontinuity, therefore, would likewise be evasive and artificial. The coming of Christ and the challenge of his gospel place Judaism in a situation of crisis. No Christian witness can be unsympathetic with that, seeing how Christians themselves face a similar crisis before the same Christ. Having done so as Christians, however, they cannot abandon the New Testament proclamation even though they must recognize that that proclamation continues to put contemporary Judaism under the same original challenge. Yet there is only one way for Christian witness to share in that ordeal, namely, in the same compassion and solidarity with the hearers that Christ has displayed toward Christians themselves, and with the same concern he has for every aspect of the hearer's entire well-being.

III. JEWISH-CHRISTIAN RELATIONS: REPENTANCE AND HOPE

This topic has been studied carefully in the past and has been described in several documents previously issued by the LWF, its member churches, and other Christian bodies. In what follows we intend to offer some suggestions which will serve as addenda to these statements.

When we speak of the guilt and responsibility of Lutherans and other Christians in having fostered and allowed anti-semitism, we should not give the impression that Christianity is simply identified with the old "Western" (and "Eastern") churches. The arrogant habit of describing Western experience as if it were global must be discontinued. The churches of Asia and Africa have not had the same part in this sordid history. We urge them, however, to define and expose the potential or actual forms of anti-semitism that may be theirs.

We Lutherans must be aware of our peculiar forms of potential and actual anti-semitism. An indiscriminating disparagement of the Law in our theology, preaching, instruction, and piety frequently has as its tragic result a caricaturing of the Jew as the epitome of hypocrisy and works-righteousness to the point of putting the label of "Judaizing" upon the common human tendency towards legalism. This fact emphasizes the need to study this problem and to invite Jewish scholars to examine our materials for this kind of anti-semitism.

Jesus said: "If you are offering your gift at the altar, and there remember that your brother has something against you ... ("Matthew 5:23). Not least in Jewish-Christian relations is this word an important one. For here the question is not only about our feelings of love and our rights to witness, but also of whether others have something against us. That is why we must listen to the Jewish community. We must sense their pain and hear their voice on the question of the threat and reality of anti-semitism and of how to improve Jewish-Christian relations. Christian documents are by now rich in admissions of guilt for past sins. Some of our Jewish friends will tell us that our guilt feelings do them little good. They may benefit us even less. Our repentance is worthy of the name only if it leads to change, to renewed hope, to prayer and work for a better future. An essential step is to ask our Jewish neighbours what hurts them. A rabbinic story tells of the excited student who said to his teacher, "Rabbi, I love you." The rabbi replied, "Do you know what

hurts me?" The student answered, "No." The rabbi asked, "How then can you say that you love me?"

The conflict in the Middle East raises difficult questions about the future of the Jewish people, the rights of Palestinian Arabs and the problems of all refugees. Lutherans and other Christians are painfully aware of the fact that Christianity has for 19 centuries been a source of anti-semitic thought and action. We cannot confess our guilty involvement in the Holocaust of the 1940s without committing ourselves to action that will prevent the repetition of such a tragedy. We must say, "Never Again!" We know that the right to live cannot be securely enjoyed unless peace is achieved. We therefore call upon Lutheran churches to make responsible contributions toward the achievement of peace and reconciliation, justice and dignity, among all the peoples of the Middle East.

IV. PROSPECTS FOR THE FUTURE

It has been the practice of Lutherans to approach their responsibilities by giving careful attention to the biblical and theological aspects of problems. The topic of Lutheran-Jewish relationships for example has been studied over a long period of time by individual scholars, and during the past decade several significant statements have been issued by Lutheran churches in various countries and by Lutheran World Federation conferences. These statements do not constitute a final or complete treatment of the topic, but they have spoken to the important questions and indicate a growing concern among Lutherans.

At this point, it is easy to say that further study should be given to many topics. Some of these topics need to be clarified among Lutherans and others should be discussed with representatives of the Jewish community. We have in mind such themes as election, covenant, and the people of God; Judaism as a living religion; the relation of the Old Testament and the New; the significance of the law; sin, guilt, and suffering; Jewish and Christian anthropology; the goals, aims, and procedures of mission and dialogue; the historical and present dimensions and remedies of anti-semitism; the theological and moral implications of the Holocaust; the meaning of Judaism for Christian self-understanding; the significance of the state of Israel in its Middle Eastern context; and the search for peace, justice, and human rights throughout the human community.

Such topics will always need further study and will no doubt continue to be examined by individuals and groups. Emphasis should now be placed upon the dissemination and use of studies and declarations that are our common possession. In the pursuit of this objective, European and American committees are now able to give more effective leadership in the collection, interpretation, and distribution of useful study documents.

Unless Lutheran position papers have some practical consequences on regional and local levels, the studies will have been made in vain. We believe that the process of study, publication, and interaction with other Lutherans and Jews should continue regionally and locally. But we also believe that the Lutheran World Federation can perform essential services for its member churches as all Lutherans work together to deepen their sense of solidarity with the sufferings of the Jewish people. We

therefore urge the Lutheran World Federation, through its appropriate offices, to:

- 1) Maintain contact between groups in several continents which are conducting studies and formulating policies with respect to Lutheran-Jewish relations. Commissions have already been formed in Europe and America which have the function of furthering the exchange of studies and information, and promoting engagement in common projects. This work is being carried out in the form of working parties, study conferences, and publications. These commissions will coordinate these tasks within the churches so far as it is desirable and possible.
- 2) Cooperate in all possible ways with the World Council of Churches' Committee on the Church and the Jewish People and with other ecumenical agencies, such as the Vatican's Commission for Religious Relations with the Jews, in the pursuit of objectives mentioned above. Cooperation should also occur at the local level between congregations and between inter-church agencies.
- 3) Collect materials that have to do with Lutheran-Jewish relations, and serve as a channel for their distribution. Work has already been done on the development of materials for ministers and congregations. Information has been prepared, for example, which will help pastors approach such texts as those which have been assigned for the 10th Sunday after Trinity (i.e., dealing with the destruction of Jerusalem). Close cooperation in this activity with the Lutheran World Federation and through the Lutheran World Federation with other churches is of highest importance. The Lutheran World Federation can serve as a clearing house of information about activities in member churches, studies conducted by theological faculties, educational materials, etc. We urge that theological faculties be regularly informed about such studies. It is important that Lutherans share with each other what they know about developments in this field of interest.
- 4) Encourage and facilitate the production of good educational materials for practical use on the regional and local levels. We urge the Lutheran World Federation staff to develop a strategy for making contact with educational commissions and publishing houses of the churches.
- 5) Remind all Lutheran agencies of the importance of consulting with representatives of the Jewish community when statements about Lutheran-Jewish relations are being prepared. Some churches have made, and continue to make, analyses of their literature with reference to explicit or implicit anti-semitism. We urge those of our member churches that have not done so to begin this task immediately and that, if at all possible, Jews be drawn in as consultants. We also recommend that when Jews are invited to attend conferences as consultants, they be

included in the planning stage.

- 6) Hold occasional conferences for the purpose of facilitating new initiatives in study and action, to give a more adequate expression of a common mind among Lutherans, and to induct new persons into the field of study and work.
- 7) Take steps to prevent the isolation of Lutheran-Jewish relations from the area of mission in general. We propose that Lutheran-Jewish activities be pursued in concert with the Lutheran World Federation Department of Church Cooperation.
- 8) Provide suitable staff support for the international coordination of Lutheran efforts to approach Jews in a responsible manner. We are aware of financial problems, but we give such high priority to this work that we urge the establishment of a separate desk or office in the Lutheran World Federation to deal with Lutheran-Jewish relations. We also recommend that a small advisory group be established to work with the Department of Studies staff both in following up the recommendations of this consultation and in planning for additional work in the area of Lutheran-Jewish concerns.
- 9) Recommend to member churches that in each country or church, where feasible, a central office or desk be established for responsibilities for Lutheran-Jewish concerns similar to those carried by the Lutheran World Federation.
- 10) Give place to Lutheran-Jewish concerns both in the planning and on the agenda of the 1977 Lutheran World Federation Assembly.

¹For the 1964 Løgumkloster materials, see Lutheran World Vol.X, No.4 (October 1963) and Vol.XI, No.3 (July 1964). Subsequent study by a special Committee on the Church and the Jews was completed in 1969 and appended to the Løgumkloster statement. The entire document is reprinted as an Appendix in Speaking of God Today: Jews and Lutherans in Conversation, Paul D. Opsahl and Marc H. Tanenbaum, editors (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1974), pp.166-173.

The 1973 Neuendettelsau Report has been distributed through official LWF channels in offset form. Copies are available in English or German from the Dept. of Studies, LWF, route de Ferney, 1211 Geneva 20, Switzerland.. The German version, with appendices, also appeared in March 1974 as a special bulletin of the Arbeitskreis für Kirche und Judentum of the VELKD. Copies are available from Evangeliumsdienst unter Israel, 85 Nürnberg, Motterstr.1, BRD.

²See references in Footnote 1 to the Løgumkloster and Neuendettelsau statements. In addition, cf. "Some Observations and Guidelines for Conversations between Lutherans and Jews," drawn up by the Division of Theological Studies of the Lutheran Council in the USA in 1971 (reprinted as an Appendix in Speaking of God Today, pp.163-165); a "Statement of Comment and Council" adopted by the ALC at its 1974 Convention in Detroit titled "The American Lutheran Church and the Jewish Community", (cf. 1974 Reports and Actions, Part 3, Seventh General Convention of the ALC, pp.917-922); "Christen und Juden", a study of the Commission on the Church and Judaism of the Evang. Church in German (EKD) (Gütersloh: Verlagshaus Gerd Mohn, 1975).

Kerygma and Martyria in the New Testament

Christoph Burchard

I. Preliminary Remarks

It is my understanding that this paper should place before the Consultation the possible NT antecedents of those two forms of communicating the Christian faith to non-Christians generally, and to Jews in particular, that are currently discussed under the headings of "mission" and "dialog". The way the topic has been formulated by the Planning Committee suggests that this can be done by investigating the meaning of a couple of Greek words, viz. kerygma and martyria, cognates of course included.¹ This will not do. K. and M. are not nearly as prominent in the NT as it might appear from the place they hold in modern theological jargon²; their ancient synonyms such as euangelion, euangelizesthai, katangellein, logos tou theou, etc. need to be considered along with them. What is more, only one NT writer, Luke, uses K. and M. to denote a difference between things rather than between different aspects of one thing, and the difference is not that between "mission" and "dialog". So to find out what the NT has to say about the form or forms of communicating Christian faith, we will have to cover more ground than is staked out by the occurrence of K. and M. Even so, let us not be too sure that it will be possible to trace "mission" and/or "dialog" back to Scripture. It is a modern pair of concepts after all. I should, therefore, like to reframe the topic to read: Forms of Communicating Christian Faith in the New Testament. But I shall endeavour to do justice to the original wording by paying special attention to K. and M.

Much like the OT, the NT is not a book, it is a library, even though it spans only a century, not a millenium or more. It contains the works of several authors. Their views do not agree on all points. What communication of faith is, what purpose it should serve, and how it ought to be handled, is one of them. Barring heavy generalization, we cannot tell what the NT understanding of the matter is. We must proceed by instalments. In view of the above-mentioned peculiarity of Luke and the obvious qualities of Acts as a source both historical and theological, let us first turn to Luke-Acts and then work backwards through the rest of the Pauline school (except Rom. 16:25f) to Paul himself. The Johannine school and Matthew will follow. Time will not permit us to go into the rest of the NT, but there is a brief section on Jesus at the end³.

II. The Pauline School

1. Luke⁴ never uses kerygma (except "the kerygma of Jonah", Luke 11:32) or keryx, but he frequently employs keryssein to denote missionary preaching along with euangelizesthai, katangellein, etc.⁵ Its contents are commonly gathered from the so-called "missionary speeches" delivered by Peter in Acts 2,3,4,5,10,13, and by Paul in Acts 13,14 and 17. The Lucan gospel would therefore seem to be roughly equivalent to Luke's Gospel, plus monotheism. Upon closer inspection the missionary speeches are not missionary at all. Their settings are different from the regular occasions for preaching (see below), keryssein and synonyms are never used to introduce what the speaker does, and the speeches themselves are not designed to impart the gospel message. Take for instance Acts 10: 34-43. Peter does not preach, he explains how he came to be a preacher and winds up by quoting what his message is: "And he (God) commanded us to preach to the people, and to testify that he is the one

ordained by God to be judge of the living and the dead. To him all the prophets bear witness that every one who believes in him receives forgiveness of sins through his name." (V. 42f.). The famous Areopagus speech, 17:22-31, exhibits much the same structure. Paul is asked not to preach but to explain his message because it sounds strange to Athenian ears. The answer is that God, because mankind failed to recognize him through the works of creation, now makes a fresh attempt to be universally recognized. "The times of ignorance God overlooked, but now he commands all men everywhere to repent, because he has fixed a day on which he will judge the world in righteousness by a man whom he has appointed, and of this he has given assurance to all men by raising him from the dead." (v. 30f). Both speeches are not missionary sermons, nor are the others. Rather they are "witness" as set out below. But they end with short summaries of what missionary preaching is about: Jesus is ready to take the bench to preside at the Last Judgement, so repent and be forgiven (and, as we should add, prepare for eternal life). By contrast Jesus' life, death and resurrection are not proclaimed as gospel by Luke. They are the stations by which Jesus can be recognized as, and proven to be, what the gospel says he is.

According to Luke, Jesus himself was first "to preach the Kingdom" (a favourite Lucan turn found nowhere else in the NT) during his lifetime, and he commanded his disciples to do the same (Luke 9,10). Yet after Easter missionary preaching starts all over again. It is not occasioned by the risen Lord, however, as in Matthew, but by the coming of the Spirit on Pentecost day. In Luke there is no general Missionsbefehl. The Spirit comes down, and public proclamation of the gospel begins without further ado.

It is addressed "to all nations" (Luke 24:47) or to "all men everywhere" (Acts 17:30). This includes the Jews. Luke does not know of two versions of the gospel, one for Jews and one for Gentiles, as is sometimes concluded from the difference between the speeches in Acts 2-13 and the Areopagus speech. All men have to be told that the Judge is at hand, be called to repentance and offered eternal life. There is, however, a difference as to what people have to repent for, besides every person's share of individual sin. The Jews in Jerusalem - only these, not Jews generally, let alone mankind - are guilty of Jesus' death. Gentiles have wrongly failed to recognize God and have adored idols instead. Both may be forgiven because they acted "in ignorance" (Acts 3:17; 17:30).

Jews, however, have the privilege to be told first. After all, the gospel is in fulfilment of God's promises to Israel which have been cherished at least by some through the ages as a living hope.⁶ So missionary preaching begins in Jerusalem. So Paul invariably starts out in the local synagogue. Yet as a rule the Jews, or at least their leaders, react violently to the gospel and refuse to give it a home in their midst. As far as Paul is concerned Luke expounds this in three different scenes which are constructed along the same lines, Acts 13:14ff, 18:5ff, and 28:17ff. They have often been taken to mean that the gospel must not be offered to Gentiles until the Jews had turned it down. But then it is strange that this idea should be absent from the Cornelius story which marks the fundamental transition of the gospel from the Jews to Gentiles, Acts 10-11. Anyway, Gentiles are already among the audience in the synagogues in the persons of God-fearers (Acts 13:16,26). The problem is not to whom the gospel should be addressed and when, but where. It was designed to turn Israel into the universal people of God that would include all nations. Since the Jews as a whole will not let this happen on their premises, the proclamation of the gospel finds a home among the Gentiles, only to pursue the same universal goal as before.

To be a preacher all a person needs is to be possessed by the Spirit. No one told Paul to preach; he simply begins after he encountered Jesus near Damascus (Acts 9:19ff). Yet Luke does not convey the impression that every Christian is a preacher although all of them do have the Spirit. True, when the Jerusalem community was driven into exile after the execution of Stephen, "those who were scattered went about preaching the word" (Acts 8:4, cf. 11:19ff). But as a rule preaching is done formally and by professionals such as the Twelve, Barnabas, Paul, Apollos. The ordinary Christian may spread the gospel informally, by conduct, or otherwise, as in fact no doubt he did, but Luke has little to say about this.

According to Luke, Christian preachers did not develop any special missionary technique. They used the opportunities offered by contemporary religious and philosophical life. They may distinguish themselves by rhetorics, miraculous powers⁷, or even nautical skill as Paul did when sailing to Rome, but they are not radically different in appearance from "those who preach Moses" (Acts 15:21) or "a preacher of foreign divinities" (17:18). They just head the procassion. So they take advantage of the Temple in Jerusalem, the local synagogues, even a philosopher's class room (Acts 19:9), and talk to the people as happen to be present at the usual hours of gathering. No preacher ever goes out of his way to invite people to come hear his sermon.

Also, Lucan preachers do not carry the gospel to other places of their own accord. Displacement comes about as a rule by some action from above as in Acts 13:1ff. or from without, i.e. persecution as in Acts 8:4; 11:19ff. Even Paul does not have what might be called a missionary strategy, but is dependent for the geographical progress of his work upon divine directions and/or hostile reactions, mostly from Jews (of course, Luke sees the hand of Providence in this, too). In Luke's mind, the worldwide extension of Christianity never was a question of missionary effort and strategy. It was a miracle foretold and performed by God himself through his human agents.

His prime agent, of course, is Paul. The Apostles, Peter included, preach in Palestine and never leave the country. "Those who were scattered because of the persecution that arose over Stephen" (11:19ff) go to Cyprus and the Levantine coast, coming to a stop in Antioch. It is not before Paul is sent out from there (13:1ff., by the Spirit, not the community!) that the gospel really begins to travel. Paul takes it to Rome. Luke gives him credit for having proclaimed the gospel all over the world. He lets him be accused as "the man who is teaching men everywhere against the people and the law and this place" (Acts 21:28), "an agitator among all the Jews throughout the world" (24:5). Looking back upon his career, Paul states that he "declared first to those at Damascus, then at Jerusalem and throughout all the country of Judea, and also to the Gentiles, that they should repent and turn to God and perform deeds worthy of their repentance" (26:20). So in Luke's eyes Paul's mission was not the initial phase of what was to become a permanent task of the church, to be carried on until Kingdom come. When Paul had completed his two years' term of preaching in Rome (Acts 28:30f), "in principle the Gentile mission was over" (O'Neill, 164).

This is not to say that Luke's church did not welcome newcomers, Jews included. But as far as I can see, it takes no particular steps to assure church growth. There is not a word to this effect in Paul's farewell address to the elders from Ephesus, Acts 20:18-35, who are really his successors. Their work is to be pastoral, not missionary.

"Witness" in Luke is another story, at least as far as the substantive, martyrs, is concerned. Luke applies it only to a limited number of historical persons, the Twelve Apostles and Paul. Let us begin with the Twelve.

It is well known that Luke assigns to the Twelve Apostles a special function which is fundamental to the church everywhere and at all times.¹⁰ What it is is much better expressed in the epithet, martyres, bestowed upon them in Luke 24:48; Acts 1:8,22; 2:32; 3:15; 5:32; 10:39,41; 13:31, then by the traditional title of "apostles" which Luke reserves exclusively for them. The first passage is perhaps also the most telling, Luke 24:36-49. The scene opens with an appearance of the risen Lord unparalleled in the NT. He has "flesh and bones" which the disciples "are invited to look at" (v.39). This, Jesus declares, goes to confirm his announcements that everything written about him in Scripture must be fulfilled (v.45), i.e. the death and resurrection of the Christ and the preaching of repentance to all nations, beginning in Jerusalem (v.47). "You are witnesses of these things" (v.48). This is not the Lucan Missionsbefehl, as is commonly assumed. If it were, the contents of missionary preaching would have to include the preaching itself, which is absurd. Furthermore, as suggested above, the speeches in Acts do not convey the idea that the Lucan gospel was focussed upon the death and resurrection of Christ. Finally, though this is a minor point, Luke 24:48 is not a command at all. So what really happens in Luke 24:36-49 is that Jesus appoints the apostles to be witnesses to the truth of "these things". Which? It would not be enough to point to v.47 as an answer. No doubt "these things" must be taken to include also the appearance of the risen Lord which occasioned v.47 in the first place. So the testimony of the witnesses contains the resurrection of Christ inasmuch as it is a fulfilment of God's promises in the OT, as pointed out by the risen Lord himself. The testimony is not gospel, but it assures the legitimacy and the truth of the gospel. The appointment of witnesses naturally has a mandatory aspect too. They are to testify unhesitatingly whenever called, and they will be called as the speeches in Acts show. But it is not inherent in the concept of witness to volunteer information, let alone to travel to spread that information. A witness' place is on the stand in a court room. It is not by accident that most speeches in Acts are set in a court room scene or what amounts to it.

Much of what has been said could be confirmed from the Election of Matthias, Acts 1:15-26. The person who is to replace Jude as an apostle must have been with Jesus "beginning from the baptism of John until the day when he was taken up from us" in order to "become with us a witness to his resurrection" (v.22). To be a witness in the Lucan sense of the word it is not enough to have been with Jesus all the time, though this is a prerequisite; one has to be appointed. And the main thing he has to testify to is not Jesus' life in general, but the resurrection. We will have to remember this when we turn to Paul.

Further information comes from Acts 1:6-8. It is a parallel to Luke 24:36-49, but not a repetition. The apostles are not appointed, but given a promise. "You shall receive power when the Holy Spirit has come upon you; and you shall be my witnesses in Jerusalem and in all Judea and Samaria and to the end of the earth" (v.8). This is in reply to the question, v.6: "Will you at this time restore the kingdom to Israel?" The question is answered in the negative; the kingdom will not come before the witnesses have been called to testify on Jesus' behalf "to the end of the earth". But as we have remarked, the Apostles remain in Palestine to be what 13:31 describes as "his witnesses to the people". The promise of Acts 1:8 is fulfilled by Paul - granted that he is a witness of the same quality as the Apostles.

Paul is twice accorded the epithet, martyrs. In his own words, Ananias told him after his conversion: "The God of our fathers appointed you to know his will, to see the Just One and to hear a voice from his mouth; for you will be a witness for him to all men of what you have seen and heard" (22:14f). Or, as Paul says

Jesus declared on the same occasion: "For I have appeared to you for this purpose, to appoint you to serve and bear witness (hypersten kai martyra) to the things in which you have seen me and to those in which I will appear to you" (26:16). Opinions are divided as to whether Luke uses martyrs in these two passages to put Paul on the same footing as the Apostles as regards their fundamental function in the church, although he will never be an apostle according to the standards of Acts 1:21f, or whether martyrs has a different shade of meaning when applied to Paul. In view of the vocabulary used in the passages just quoted, quite apart from martyrs 12, I feel that there is more to be said for the former view. And if resurrection was to be the central part of testimony, Paul certainly was in a position to testify because he had "heard and seen" the risen Lord. In Luke's mind Paul is as good as an apostle, and even better. Through him not only the gospel has been universally proclaimed, but also the testimony which is proof of the gospel.

2. The Pastoral Epistles use both K and M without much difference of meaning: kerygma, II Tim. 4:17; Tit. 1:3; keryx, I Tim. 2:7; II Tim 1:11; keryssein, I Tim. 3:16; II Tim. 4:2; martyrein, I Tim. 6:13; martyrion, I Tim. 2:6; II Tim. 1:8. Both groups of words are almost exclusively employed to characterize the missionary work of Paul. Kerygma is "the preaching with which I have been entrusted by command of God our Saviour", preaching, that is, of God's word which he made manifest at the appointed time to reveal eternal life promised ages ago (Tit. 1:2f). It is this very preaching which before the court in Rome came to its fullness, "so that all the Gentiles might hear it" (II Tim. 4:17).¹³ It may also be called "the euangelion for which I was appointed a preacher (keryx) and apostle and teacher" (II Tim. 1:11). When it is said, in a sort of hymn quoted in I Tim. 3:16, that Jesus "was preached among the nations (ekerychthe en tois ethnesin)" the author of I Tim. no doubt understand that it was Paul who did this. In one place only is K applied to Timothy: "preach the word" (II Tim. 4:2). keryssein probably does not have a technical meaning here, and anyway it is embedded in a series of similar words describing what Timothy's duty is as a true minister of the word. Turning to M, we find martyrion as a synonym of kerygma and euangelion when it is said: "the testimony (borne) at the proper time, for which I was appointed a keryx and apostle ..., a teacher of the Gentiles in faith and truth" (I Tim. 2:6f)¹⁴. The same applies to "Do not be ashamed then of the testimony of (or, to) our Lord, nor of me his prisoner, but take your share of suffering for the gospel in the power of God" (II Tim. 1:8). RSV has "of testifying to our Lord", thus referring martyrion to Timothy's testimony. This does not agree well with "nor of me", nor with the fact that the passage is modelled upon Rom. 1:16 ("I am not ashamed of the gospel ..."). So martyrion again is the kerygma or euangelion (cf. II Tim. 1:11) once brought by Paul, now to be preserved by Timothy. There is one more passage to look at. Timothy is told, "Fight the good fight of the faith; take hold of the eternal life to which you were called when you made the good confession in the presence of many witnesses. In the presence of God who gives life to all things, and of Jesus Christ who in his testimony (martyresas) before Pontius Pilate made the good confession, I charge you to keep the commandment unstained..." (I Tim. 6:12-14). There has been some debate as to whether "Jesus' testimony" consisted in words he said during his passion or the passion itself. Possibly the text uses a formula which spoke of the passion as testimony and enlarged it by "made the good confession" to yield a parallel to Timothy's confession (no doubt on the occasion of his ordination, the "witnesses" being either the community or the board of presbyters). However that may be, the parallel between Jesus and Timothy is not drawn by means of the word martyresas, but by "confession". If Timothy is to live up to his ordination vows, he is not to do so by imitating Jesus' "testimony", whatever it was.

A pretty consistent picture emerges from these passages. Both K and M do not as a rule refer to whatever Timothy, Titus, or, by implication, their brother ministers do or ought to do in fulfilment of the duties of their office. The typical term for this in the Pastorals is didaskein, "to teach". K and M are used for what Paul has done, once and for all. He brought the kerygma to all nations. This was part of God's redemptive action to reveal "at the proper time" the kerygma which had until then been hidden as a mystery. The spreading of the kerygma is now finished. Of course it is still there, in the form of handy formulae such as II. Tim. 1:10 etc., to be used by Timothy and his like as a basis for preaching, teaching, exhortation and apologetics. Winning new converts is not listed among their duties, let alone foreign mission.

3. In Colossians/Ephesians 15 there is only one relevant occurrence of K and none of M. Jesus, says Col. 1:23, has made the Colossians "holy and blameless", "provided that you continue in the faith, stable and steadfast, not shifting from the hope of the gospel which you heard, which has been preached to every creature under heaven, and of which I, Paul, became a minister." As in the Pastorals, keryssein of the gospel is a thing successfully completed by Paul, and again it is based on the revelation of a "mystery hidden for ages and generations, but now made manifest to his saints" (1:26), i.e. the church (not the angels), and is concerned with the salvation of the Gentiles (1:27). So when 1:5f tells about "the gospel which has come to you, as indeed in the whole world it is bearing fruit and growing" we should not understand that the gospel is still being spread, but that it is bearing fruit in the spiritual life of the Christian communities all over the world, or, in terms of the imagery used in the hymn Col. 1:15ff, in the growth of the all-including body of Christ who is the church (cf. also 2:19). Doubtless this includes numeral growth too. But the author is not interested in that. It is only when he comes to the principles of individual Christian conduct that he enjoins the Colossians, "Conduct yourselves wisely toward outsiders, making the most of the time. Let your speech always be gracious, seasoned with salt, so that you may know how you ought to answer every one (4:5f.). Behave so as not to deter would-be converts and be able to answer questions about the Christian faith. So there may be some dialog going on, but merely in a passive way. Israel is outside the scope of the letter. The author affirms that in the body of Christ, "there cannot be Greek and Jew ... but Christ is all, and in all" (3:11). So he is certainly not opposed to the conversion of Jews, but generally he puts them on the same level as the Greeks.

Ephesians is so close to Colossians in many ways that it will suffice to single out a few points of difference that are relevant to our subject: For some reason which must have been suggested to the author by historical circumstance, although we can only guess what it was, he illustrates the all-including nature of the body of Christ by the fact that in Christ "you Gentiles", once "separated from Christ, alienated from the commonwealth of Israel, and strangers to the covenants of promise", have "now in Christ Jesus" been created "one new man" together with the Jews (2:11-18). The author is not, however, talking about a heilsgeschichtliche priority of the Jews: Neither are the Gentiles rallied to Israel, nor is the church by any means the continuation or fulfilment of Israel. The emphasis is on oneness in a new creation. In fact, it has been remarked that Ephesians is not really interested in the fact that the church is made up of both Jews and Gentiles, but in the contrast of what the Gentiles were not when "separated from Christ" with what they are now after being incorporated into Christ's body. So I doubt whether Eph. 2:11ff. means that the author is extending a hand to Israel. Secondly, it is well known that the church is in the centre of Ephesians' thought. Its life and growth are assured through gifts which Christ

gave to every member. "And his gifts were that some should be apostles, some prophets, some evangelists, some pastors and teachers, for the equipment of the saints, for the work of ministry, for building up the body of Christ, until we all attain to the unity of the faith ..." (4:11-13). This is not radically different from what the Pastorals said, and what Colossians could have said, about the purpose of the Christian ministry, but neither of them stated as frankly that a Christian minister must first of all look after the spiritual perfection of the church. Again numeral growth need not be excluded. But it must not be overlooked that unlike Colossians, Ephesian admonishes its readers to separate themselves from the Gentiles who are spoken of in highly deprecatory tones in 4:17ff.

To sum up, Luke, the Pastorals and Colossians/Ephesians all agree upon Paul's unique role as a universal Church Father. He spread the kerygma all over the world where it is now handed on in the individual communities as a tradition to live by. The communities are no closed shops, winning new members perhaps also among Jews, but apparently no special measures are taken to assure church growth. The big difference as far as our subject is concerned is Israel. While Luke feels that Jesus fulfils the promises given to Israel and adduces testimony, both scriptural and historical, to this effect, the Pastorals and Colossians/Ephesians do no such thing. That Paul had a keen interest in Israel, a point rightly stressed by Luke, is entirely forgotten. They make little use of the OT. There is no serious attempt to show how Jesus fulfils Scripture, and it need not be made because Christianity is a brand new religion based on revelation, having no roots in Judaism or elsewhere. Scripture is a part of the Christian heritage, of course, but not the common heritage of both Jews and Christians. Were it not for Ephes. 2:11ff and a few isolated spots elsewhere, Israel might never have existed.

4. Paul uses keryssein in Rom. 10:8,14,15; I Cor. 1:23; 9:27; 15:11,12; II Cor. 1:19; 4:5; 11:4; Gal. 2:2; 5:11; Phil. 1:15; I Thess. 2:9 (Jewish keryssein Rom. 2:21). Kerygma is rare: I Cor 1:21; 2:4; 15:14 (Rom. 16:25 is non-Pauline). He is not fond of M: martyrein I Cor. 15:15, pseudomartyres tou theou I Cor. 15:15, martyrion I Cor. 1:6; 2:1. Both K and M refer to the same thing, missionary preaching, as do euangelizesthai, euangelion and others.¹⁶ To give a complete account of Paul's message and his accours as its spokesman would require a book. Let us be content with a few highlights.

It is important to realize that Paul seems to reserve keryssein, euangelizesthai etc. to designate the initial presentation of the gospel in a given place. This may consist of more than one sermon and extend over a period of time. Also it is not required that the audience should be non-Christian; Paul intends to euangelizesthai in Rome (Rom. 1:15). But apparently he draws a line between such primary activities and what happens after it in building up a church or in normal church life by way of preaching, teaching, maybe even baptismal instruction (I. Cor. 1:17). Contrary to modern usage, Paul never refers to this as keryssein, euangelizesthai etc., his own pastoral work included. For an utterance to be called euangelion, "good news", it not only has to be good, it must also be news.

When Paul delivers the good news he is not just voicing inspiration. He has a text or texts to base his words upon, e.g. I. Cor. 15:3ff; Rom. 1:3f., which he himself "received" as tradition that was binding upon all Christians and "handed on" to his listeners (I Cor. 15:1ff). At times euangelion and kerygma designate precisely such texts rather than actual preaching (e.g. I Cor. 15: 1,14).

These texts do not contain religious insights of some sort. They relate things which happened to Jesus Christ, primarily his death and resurrection. More exactly, they do not just report these things but explain what they mean to us: forgiveness of sins and justification. Paul does not make a slavish use of such texts. He interprets them in a very personal perspective. First of all, he does not place what happened to Jesus Christ 17(the "Christ event", to use a common if ugly theologism) in the framework of history, not even sacred history such as might have been going on in Israel. What happened in the Christ event is the end of all history and of the world and the beginning of a new world, a fresh undertaking of the sovereign God, to be compared only to creation as the beginning of the old world. This spells destruction to the powers of death and sin, and also to all religion and philosophy by which man tried to guide his life, because he used them to bolster his pride, which to Paul is a synonym for sin. This includes the Law of Moses; "Christ is the end of the Law" (Rom. 10:4). The Cross is Paul's symbol for this. Finally, the Christ event being what it is, it is not open to immediate human experience, just as man was not there when God created the old world. It was an affair between God and the supernatural powers that rule the world (I Cor. 2:8; cf. Phil. 2:5-11 etc.). All men are affected by it, but in order to really experience it, it must be brought home to them.

The way Paul sees it, the kerygma does it. It is the form in which Christ is "near" (Rom. 10:5ff). It is indispensable as a corollary to the Christ event. It may even be said that God is revealed in the kerygma, not in the Christ event itself (I Cor. 2:6ff, a concept already familiar to us from the Pastorals and Colossians/Ephesians, and also present in the post-Pauline doxology, Rom. 16:25f). In I Cor. 1:18ff Paul compares the kerygma to the divine Wisdom which was once revealed by God to enlighten man about creation and his place in it. Rejected, it was withdrawn by God. In its place He now gave "the folly of the kerygma" (1:21). Paul does not mean to say that he made a poor presentation of the kerygma. It is folly because it is opposed to all human ways of grounding life on a firm basis and giving it a perspective. So it can only be accepted "by faith", and because the kerygma is indispensable for man to be saved, so is faith.

The kerygma is based upon revelation, but according to Paul it did not come unprepared. Israel held promises which pointed to it. To be sure, unlike Luke Paul never bothers to prove from Scripture that Jesus is the Christ and that he had to die and rise to be such. That is a truth Paul holds to be self-evident from the kerygma. Yet he finds proof from Scripture for the fact that salvation is always by faith in a word of God (Abraham, Rom. 4; Gal. 3), that it is designed for all people, that the kerygma is the earthly representation of the risen Lord (Rom. 10:5ff), and many other things. That is not the way a contemporary Jew would have read the Bible. It is a bold reinterpretation of Scripture based on the assumption that God was active in the Christ event and that the kerygma is revelation.

This being so, Jews are not offered another road to salvation than by faith in the kerygma, just like the Gentiles. But they are not for that matter put on a level with the Gentiles. The kerygma is for them "first" (Rom. 1:16 etc.). They have been given privileges that were not withdrawn (Rom. 9:4f). Above all, if they now seem to refuse the kerygma, they will be given a new chance to hear it and come to faith when the gentile mission has reached its peak and the kingdom is at hand; Paul seems to think that they will then all be saved (Rom. 11:25f., 18).

According to Paul, the kerygma is not just there, it must be proclaimed publicly and universally. In this process he feels a special share has been allotted to him: delivering the kerygma to the Gentiles. He is aware that he is not alone, but he makes it a point not to preach where others did (Rom. 15:20). He did not avoid speaking to Jews (see below); he can even say that his gentile mission is but a means of stirring up the Jews so they will come to faith (Rom. 9-11). Yet his immediate goal is to convert Gentiles. It was not a matter of choice to him. God commissioned him "to preach his Son among the Gentiles" (Gal. 1:16), and

"leads us (about) in triumph" (II Cor. 2:14ff.). "Necessity is laid upon me" (I Cor. 9:16). The idea may have grown upon Paul for some time since his calling near Damascus to reach maturity, perhaps, only at the time of the Apostolic Council. Yet Paul is right in insisting that it has not dawned upon him as the result of strategic missionary reasoning. Incidentally, according to Rom. 10:15 keryssein always presupposes a commission.

We know little about Paul's missionary technique. He did not dash around but fixed himself in a place, preferably a capital, supporting himself by handwork, and proclaimed the kerygma. He probably used the synagogues as a platform, as Luke said he did, but was often compelled to look for other places to preach. When he preached, he may have started with monotheism (unless he was talking to Jews) and the parousia to provide a setting for the kerygma, as I Thess. 1:9f. suggests. We have no reason to believe that he pressed conversion in a Billy Graham-like fashion. An element of "dialog" may well have been present when he spoke. He used rhetorics and was able to perform miracles and to speak in tongues but would not have these things regarded as missionary tools (II Cor. 10-13). He would condone both Jewish and non-Jewish customs "that I might by all means save some" (I Cor. 9:19ff.), just so this did not interfere with his "freedom in Christ". He was content to deliver the kerygma proper and left the follow-up work including baptism to other persons (I Cor. 1:17). Nevertheless he saw to it that a community was established where people would live together "in Christ". This was a new social phenomenon, however similar such communities might be to religious clubs and the like. When Paul had succeeded to get a community or communities going in a given place or area he moved on, keeping in contact with the churches by envoys, personal visits, and letters.

The very nature of Paul's keryssein or euangelizesthai precludes its being continued by the churches. Rather he expects them to support him on his kerygmatic journey with both money and manpower. They are not supposed to launch a foreign mission of their own. Yet one might expect to find the Pauline churches at least engaged in evangelistic activities of some sort. Paul's letters have not much to say on the subject (cf. perhaps Phil. 2:15f. and I Thess. 1:8, but I doubt that they refer to formal preaching). Apparently the communities grew more or less spontaneously. If I Cor. 14:23ff. stands generalization, worship was open, and attractive, to non-believers and should therefore be conducted in such a fashion that they would understand what was being said and so be induced to confess that God is "really among you" (v.25). More private or even non-verbal ways of communicating faith are the best hinted at by Paul. In a mixed marriage there is a chance that the believing party may save the unbelieving (I Cor. 7:12ff., cf. I Pet. 3:1f., below); how, Paul does not say. He admonishes all Christians not to give offence to Jews, Greeks or the church, but to endorse his own permissive attitude as described in I Cor. 9:19ff. (10:31ff., cf. Matt. 5:16, below, and again Phil. 2:15f.). Christian conduct may not be a missionary tool in Paul's eyes, but it is apt to pave the road to conversion.

Apparently Paul felt that when he would have completed his mission, keryssein would be over. The postman may always ring twice, and day after day at that. The travelling spokesman of the gospel calls just once, and that's that (only the Jews will be given a second ring). "From Jerusalem and as far round as Illyricum I have fully preached the gospel of Christ.... But now, since I no longer have any room for work in these regions ... I hope to see you in passing as I go to Spain." (Rom. 15:19,23f.). Apparently Paul intended to bring his mission to a close in Spain. After this nothing would be left to do but for God to usher in the parousia.

If we look back - or forward - from Paul to his School it is easy to understand why his followers lacked missionary enthusiasm and did little if anything to

assure church growth. It is not a sign of weakness or of Christianity turning bourgeois. At least that is not the whole story. In a sense they did no more than perpetuate Paul's own views of the matter. We also understand why one wing of Paulinism lost sight of Israel. Paul himself had opened the door for this development by insisting on the revelatory nature of the kerygma.

III. The Johannine School

As we have noticed the Johannine writings¹⁹ never use K, nor, for that matter, euangelizesthai or euangelion. They use martyrein and martyria instead in a very peculiar way, other words being lalein, didaskain etc. So the Johannine writings and the group or groups who produced them are the only section of early Christianity besides Luke-Acts to use M. in a technical way, although of course it is quite different from Luke's.

1. In the Gospel of John, martyria is not focussed upon Jesus' death and resurrection as is Paul's kerygma, nor upon the parousia as is Luke's. It is best summed up in the "I" sayings such as "I am the light of the world" (8:12). It testifies that Jesus appeared on earth as the Logos incarnate to reveal the Father and, by the same token, to be the light of the world, the bread of life, etc., i.e. to provide what every man is craving for in the very heart of his existence. It is not testimony in the sense that it corroborates facts otherwise in evidence. The bread of life is to be had only by way of martyria. So the proper way to receive it is faith.

According to John the martyria goes back to Jesus himself. The Johannine Christ does not preach the kingdom, he introduces himself. In fact, he is not much of a preacher at all. He talks of course, privately and in public, but mostly by way of answering questions and putting up a defence of himself.²⁰ Perhaps this is an indication of how the Johannine martyria concept grew. 8:12 and other "I" sayings may have originated as sayings of Christian prophets who spoke in the name of the risen Lord (cf. Apoc., below). In the Gospel 8:12 is put into the mouth of the earthly Jesus, with a discussion of its testimonial value appended in 8:13ff. This looks like the answer to a reaction against free prophetic authority. A prophet is open to attack because he cannot prove who is speaking through him. Apparently the Johannine prophets, at some stage of the group's history, found it necessary to defend themselves by invoking the earthly Jesus as a model, perhaps rightly so and doubtless in good faith. The Johannine Christ is fully authorized to make such statements as 8:12, "for I know whence I have come and whither I am going." (8:14). However, John is aware that if this is reliable testimony, we have only Jesus' word that it is. He also calls the Father as a witness (8:18); but the Father is really speaking only through the Son. It is John's conviction that we have to take Jesus' martyria as it is or leave it.

This raises the problem of how the disciples' martyria after Easter can be identical with Jesus' own. Prophecy was predicated upon the Spirit: "The Spirit of truth, who proceeds from the Father, he will bear witness to me" (15:26). When prophecy was put in jeopardy and had to appeal to the earthly Jesus as a model, shadows of doubt were also cast upon the Spirit's power to ensure continuity. So the statement was amended, "and you also are witnesses, because you have been with me from the beginning" (v.27). So tradition comes to the aid of prophecy, tradition based upon the martyria of Jesus' personal disciples (cf. also 19:35; 21:24). There is still some such thing as the Spirit. But it has now become a source of motivation, not of inspiration.

John's martyria spells out how man's ultimate needs can be satisfied; yet most people know better what is good for them. Based as it is on revelation, there is no foundation laid for martyria in either Judaism or Gentile religion. It has to be judged upon its own merits, but almost everybody judges "according to the flesh" (8:15). As Jesus himself complained, "You do not receive our testimony" (3:11f.; cf. 3:32). Few people seem to accept it, only to experience the hatred of those who do not. So the martyria brings about a schism within mankind. Those who receive it walk in the light and have eternal life; the rest of mankind is in darkness and doomed to death. John insists that this is not due to the machinations of a pair of metaphysical powers, although some of his statements sound if it were. It is a situation that exists only since the appearance of Jesus and his martyria. But since then there is a real cleavage between a sphere of life and a sphere of death,²¹ even to the degree that John can state that the Logos only "dwelt among us", i.e. the Johannine Christians (1:14)²². Not that the Johannine Christians did not want to be heard by the non-Christian world. They were aware that Jesus "had sent them into the world" as he was himself sent by the Father (17:18; 20:21). Although this refers more to presence in the world than to being sent to the world, it surely implies that the Johannine martyria will in some way be communicated to non-Christians. Maybe III John even attests the existence of Johannine missionaries. Still, in John's eyes a Christian preacher operates on the borderline between the realm of life and the realm of death, a line marked by contempt, derision, and hatred, and for all his activity he will never be able to make it disappear. He will at best win over individual converts.

It is well known that John portrays "the Jews" as the chief representatives of the hostile world outside the church, excommunicating the Christians (9:22; 12:42; 16:2), even though he does not deny that the Logos became flesh as a Jew, that many Jews followed him, and that, generally, "salvation is from the Jews" (4:22). There has been a parting of ways which is irreversible, however great the actual Jewish heritage of Johannine Christianity may be. So I find it hard to regard John as a "Missionesschrift für Israel", the less so since the Johannine Christ never really argues with the Jews and insists that their questions are but so many signs of incredulity. Yet while there is nothing similar to Rom. 9-11 in John, there is no indication that conversion of Jews is impossible.

2. In I John martyrein (1:2; 4:14; 5:6,7,9,10) and martyria (5:9,10,11) are set in a different perspective. The latter faces a schism, and the author is almost entirely absorbed by the task of keeping his own segment of the flock in line by raising hell against the other. Preaching to non-Christians may still be going on, as III John suggests, but it is neither dealt with in the letter nor listed among the characteristics of the true faith which I John drives home to his readers in an almost monotonous fashion. These are mainly a set of christological formulae and the command of mutual love combined with seclusion from "the world". The world is now represented, not by the Jews, but by those "who went out from us", thus revealing themselves as "antichrists" who never really were "of us", even if they once belonged (2:18ff.; 4:1ff.). Apparently these people laid more stress on the logos qualities of Jesus and salvation by knowledge of God than on incarnation and forgiveness of sins. Christ may still have been speaking to them through the Spirit. Spiritual perfection may have meant more to them than practical ethics. Regardless of whether it is possible to tie these people in with other groups

known from early church history ("docetists", "gnosticists"), they were not intruders, but an offshot, however contaminated, of the Johannine church and may have preserved some of its more original features. I John, of course, sees it just the other way round. It is in this context that he speaks of martyrein and martyria. The relevant passages are 1:1-4 and 5:6ff.

In 1:1-4, a section full of allusions to John 1:1ff., where the author tells his readers what he proposes to do, martyrein is neither eyewitness nor an action inspired by the Spirit. It is based upon "seeing and touching" (v.1), to be sure. But the author does not claim to have known Jesus in the flesh, nor is the letter pseudepigraphical. He means to say that he holds the true tradition about Jesus and that this makes him virtually an eyewitness - him and others ("we") to whom the tradition is entrusted. As such he can go and "testify, to and proclaim the eternal life" to "you", i.e. to the community, or what is left of it, whose leader he seems to be. martyrein thus means, "to preach as an appointed keeper of tradition in accordance with what was laid down in the beginning." The same applies to 4:14; 5:6ff. is one of the most difficult portions of the NT. One of the points it makes is that the sacraments bear witness to Christ along with the Spirit, and another that subscribing to the creed that Jesus (the incarnate) is the Son of God is tantamount to "having the testimony in himself". What the author tries to get at seems to be that the martyria must be exclusively looked for in the sacraments and traditional christological dogma.

3. In addition to martyrein and martyria, the Apocalypse also has martyrs in a few places. It may well represent an earlier stage in the development of the Johannine concept, although Revelation was hardly written before the Gospel and the Letters.

According to 1:2, John "bore witness to the word of God and to the testimony of Jesus Christ, even to all that he saw." Despite the aorist, which takes up the reader's position, John refers to what he does in the book. "Word of God" and "testimony of Christ" are one and the same thing, as v.1 shows. The idea is that what John has to reveal came from God; He gave it to Jesus who in turn handed it on to John through an angel. As a prophet (v.3) John is testifying to the testimony of (the heavenly, not the earthly) Jesus which is a true rendering of the word of God. A few verses later, John states that he was on Patmos "on account of the word of God and the testimony of Jesus" (v.9). "On account of" probably means "because I had delivered" (not "in order to receive"). Apparently, then, there had been previous testimony by John. Apoc. is but a special instance of what he used to deliver. It is his job to testify. This could be confirmed from the balance of N passages in Apoc., especially those that refer to Christian martyres (2:13; 11:3; 17:6). These are not referred to as martyrs, although they were, but as witnesses like John who are distinguished from the rest of the Christians. They are the ministers of the group represented by Apoc. The letters contained in Apoc. 2f. suggest that their message contained not only "what must soon take place" (1:1), but also exhortation to repent and words of consolation. The fact that they were driven into exile, like John, or put to death, like other martyres mentioned in Apoc., indicates that they addressed their testimony not only to Christians. Not that it was much use. The church has to suffer persecution to a degree that suggests that the eschatological tribulations have begun. While the main enemy is Rome, local Jewish communities have also distinguished themselves as agencies "of Satan" (2:9; 3:9).

IV. Matthew

Matthew employs keryssein in a few, if significant, places (3:1; 4:17,23; 9:35; 10:7,27; 11:1; 24:14; 26:13), sometimes in conjunction with didaskein, "to teach", which also appears alone without much change of meaning.

The most natural object to be placed after keryssein is repentance and the nearness of the kingdom (3:1; 4:17 etc.). keryssein of the "gospel of the Kingdom" or "this gospel" (4:23; 9:35; 24:14; 26:13, the only passages in which Matthew uses euangelion) means the same thing. kerygma (except "the kerygma of Jonah", 12:41) and euangelizesthai (save in an OT quotation, 11:5) fail to show and so does the whole M group.²³ In Matthew's eyes, "proclaiming the gospel of the kingdom" is a thing that began with John the Baptist, was taken up by Jesus and the disciples whom he sent out during his lifetime, and is still going on on a world-wide scale among all nations (although I have a suspicion that he feels it is pretty well advanced). "And then the end will come" (24:14).

Yet the expression is not used in what has become the magna charta of modern mission, the "Missionary Command", 28:16-20. Apparently, Matthew felt there were more appropriate words to be used in drawing up the program of the church's missionary activities. It is addressed to the "eleven disciples" (28:16). "Disciples" in Matthew means the church. So the missionary command is given to the whole church and is valid as long as it is there, i.e. "to the close of the age" (v.20). It is based on "all authority in heaven and on earth" given to the risen Lord. This is not the authority to make the sun stand still or the like, though this is not excluded; it is the authority to teach (cf. Matt. 11:25ff.; 7:29) already possessed by the earthly Jesus, although it was then limited in action, not in fulness, to work among Israel. It is now extended to all nations. Jesus will however no more teach in person. He sends the church to continue his work: "Go therefore" (v.19). Note that no "into the world" follows, and that by itself "go" (poruthentes, often used by Matthew as an auxiliary to intensify the following verb) does not imply displacement: "Get going and make disciples of all nations". Matthew is concerned with mission, but not necessarily foreign mission. Do "all nations" include the Jews? Since Jesus concentrated upon Israel during his lifetime (10:5f.; 15:24) one would be inclined to answer in the negative. But I do not see that Matthew wishes to exclude preaching to Jews. The emphasis is rather on the extension of mission to non-Jews. Whoever the gospel is proclaimed to, they are "to be made disciples" by (a) baptism, and (b) being taught what Jesus taught, possibly not always in that order. Baptism presupposes the proclamation of the Kingdom, just as with John the Baptist. But that is not enough to make people disciples of Jesus. They must also learn what he taught. After all he had come "to fulfil the Law and the Prophets" (5:17). Christianity according to Matthew is not just faith in Christ as proclaimed by the kerygma, as Paul sees it; it means embarking upon the path of righteousness following Jesus' instructions.

"Making disciples of all nations" is not a task reserved for missionaries or appointed preachers. It is every Christian's duty. The Sermon on the Mount tells how to fulfil it. "You are the light of the world ... Let your light so shine before men, that they may see your good works and give glory to your Father who is in heaven" (5:13-16). This is not to say that every Christian has to preach the principles of Christian ethics. He has to live it and be sure that this will lead other people to acknowledge God. The Sermon on the Mount then goes on to specify the rules to follow in good works. It is not, as is often taught, a general summary of Jesus' message and/or ethics as Matthew conceived them. Its scope is at once less wide and more precise. It

tells how to live a missionary life. Matthew is perhaps the only NT writer to assign a missionary dimension to ordinary, everyday discipleship.²⁴

V. Jesus

If the gospel tradition is at all to be trusted, Jesus announced the nearness of the kingdom of God, i.e. the ultimate and final rise to power of God himself who would henceforth allow no one, Satan, Caesar, sin or disease, to stand between him and man. This is commonplace. However, Jesus did more than just announce the kingdom. According to Luke 11:20 par. Matt. 12:28, a saying all but universally recognized as authentic, he declared that "if it is by the finger of God that I cast out demons, then the kingdom of God has come upon you." The kingdom is not purely future, it is already realized, if only partially. As far as we can tell, such realization included not only exorcisms, but also the healing activities of Jesus in general, as well as words of forgiveness, table-fellowship with the outcast, and so forth. The preaching of the kingdom is much in the nature of a commentary to some accompanying reality, although of course it holds the promise of more.

So what Jesus did was to share the benefits of the kingdom such as were already available and to engender the hope that this was but the dawning of an ultimate fulfilment in power and glory. To this end he was wandering about as a vagabond preacher and miracle worker. He left people behind him who believed him and lived by standards he set, but we hear nothing about the formation of groups. Jesus did, however, single out certain men to follow him as his personal disciples and to take part, upon his personal authorization, in the presentation of the kingdom by both miracles and preaching (Luke 10:1-12 etc).

Jesus ministered to non-Jews only by way of exception (Matt. 8:5-13 par. Luke 7:1-10), but he expected that God's kingdom would ultimately embrace people from all nations (Matt. 8:11f.). It is difficult to see how he thought this would come about; possibly through a pilgrimage to Jerusalem at the last hour, certainly not by a worldwide mission.

1. I shall use 'K.' and 'M.' for 'kerygma and cognates', 'martyria and cognates', of course only as far as they are used in some connection with communication of faith (e.g., eis martyron with the dative or epi, Mark 1:44 par. Matt. 8:4; Luke 5:14 etc., is not pertinent save in Luke 21:13; cf. note 23). - Thanks are due to Horst Krüger for typing and correcting the manuscript.
2. Distribution is uneven, too. K. is absent from the Johannine writings (save Apoc. 5:2, angelic proclamation), from Hebrews and the Catholic Epistles except I Pet. 3:19; II Pet. 2:5. M. fails to show in the Synoptics save Luke 21:13 (see note 1), and is rare elsewhere except in Luke-Acts and the Johannine writings. Incidentally, K. is no more popular in post-N.T. times.
3. The studies I have drawn upon include J. Beutler, Martyria, 1972; N. Brox, Zeuge und Märtyrer, 1961; Chr. Burchard, Der dreizehnte Zeuge, 1970; G. Dellling, Wort Gottes und Verkündigung im Neuen Testament, 1971; G. Friedrich, 'keryx etc.', Theologisches Wörterbuch zum Neuen Testament, vol. iii, 1938, 682-717; L. Goppelt, Christentum und Judentum im ersten und zweiten Jahrhundert, 1954; F. Hahn, Mission in the New Testament, 19 ; M. Hengel, 'Die Ursprünge der christlichen Mission', New Testament Studies, xviii, 1971/72, 15-38; G. Hill, 'Prophecy and Prophets in the Revelation of St. John', ibid., 401-418; H. Kasting, Die Anfänge der christlichen Mission, 1969; H. von Lips, Die Ordination in den Pastoralbriefen, Theological Dissertation, Heidelberg, 1973, 28ff. et al.; A. D. Nock, Conversion, 1933; J. C. O'Neill, The Theology of Acts in its Historical Setting, 2nd ed., 1970; K. H. Rengstorff - S. von Kortzfleisch, ed., Kirche und Synagoge, vol. i, 1968; H. Strathmann, 'martyrs etc.', Theologisches Wörterbuch zum Neuen Testament, vol. iv, 1942, 477-520; C. Wolff, 'Christ und Welt im 1. Petrusbrief', Theologische Literaturzeitung, c, 1975, 333-342; D. Zeller, Juden und Heiden in der Mission des Paulus, 1972. - Quotations according to the Revised Standard Version unless otherwise stated.
4. I call him Luke although I feel that the author of Luke-Acts never met Paul in the flesh. Nor is he particularly concerned with propagating the Pauline heritage. He just takes it for granted.
5. Luke has euangelion only in Acts 15:7; 20:24 as a Paulinizing touch.
6. According to Luke Judaism, in its own understanding, is not legalism, but a religion of universal hope. The O.T. laws constitute the national mores of the Jews which are not binding upon other peoples, as they do have mores of their own.
7. Miracles do not serve as missionary tools. They are predicated upon faith. But they may be used as a starting point to address people who are attracted by them (Acts 3).
8. Contrary to what some think, Luke feels the parousia is not too far away, and the church is not a triumphant one. The presbyters have their hands full fighting political menace, heresy (Acts 20:29f.), and individual failure (Luke 8:11-15). 'Through many tribulations we must enter the kingdom of God' (Acts 14:22).
9. Stephen is also once called 'thy witness' by Paul in Acts 22:20. This must be accounted for as an exception, just as Luke calls Paul and Barnabas 'apostles' in Acts 14:4, 14, although in his eyes they are not.
10. They also have a job as leaders of the church in Palestine, but this need not concern us here.
11. They are not called 'apostles', but to judge from Acts, it must be them Luke has in mind.
12. Compare 'to appoint', 26:16, with 'chosen', 10:41, and 'minister and witness' ('to serve and bear witness', RSV) 26:16 with 'eyewitnesses and ministers of the word', Luke 1:2.
13. I do not agree with RSV here. - In the verses just quoted, kerygma probably means both act and content.

14. 2:6 quotes a formula. If to martyriou kairois idiois comes from it, it may originally have had another meaning: Christ's death was itself a testimony. (cf. Tit. 1:2f.).
15. I take Colossians to be a real letter written by a personal disciple of Paul, Ephesians a theological treatise by a later author who used Col. and Pauline letters as written sources.
16. Therefore euangelion can be used as an object after keryssein, just as euangelizesthai may be followed by the object which is frequent after keryssein, Jesus (Christ). A good base for studying these words in Paul are some portions where they coalesce such as I Cor. 1 and 15.
17. Incarnation is familiar to Paul (Phil. 2:6-11), but he does not make much of it.
18. He bases his opinion on a personal prophetic revelation. I follow Zellers' interpretation of this exceedingly difficult passage. Other scholars take it to mean that Israel will be accepted the way it is, without a renewed offer of the kerygma followed by conversion.
19. In spite of their uniformity as regards both theology and language, they are to be ascribed to different authors (except II and III John), who represent different stages in the development of the Johannine group or movement. Moreover, the Gospel and perhaps also I John are the outcome of a complex process of growth, the last stage being a revision which cut back many of its less conventional features. While some think that this was restricted to the addition of ch. 21 and a few glosses plus some rearrangement of the material (e.g., R. Bultmann), more recently scholars are inclined to think that the revision produced large portions of the present Gospel, including chs. 15, 16, and perhaps 17.
20. This may be one of the reasons why John avoids keryssein and euangelizesthai. It is certainly one of the reasons why only twice it is said that Jesus himself 'testified' (4:44; 13:21). In the balance of passages he talks about his testimony. The most relevant portions are 3:11f., 31-36; 8:12ff.
21. Perhaps we should say that both spheres as such are preexistent owing to God's predestination, but adherence of the individual is by decision.
22. Many scholars refer 'us' V. 14a to the disciples as representatives of mankind, and 'we' V. 14b to the disciples as representatives of the saved. There is no philological foundation for this interpretation.
23. eis martyriou autois kai tois ethnesin (10:18) does not mean, 'to bear testimony before them and the Gentiles' (RSV), but, 'this fact will be used as evidence against them (at the Last Judgment)'. The same holds good for 24:14.
24. So does I Pet. (cf. 2:12; 3:1f., 15f.), if we are to follow Wolff. I wonder.

INFLUENCES WHICH HAVE AFFECTED OUR UNDERSTANDING OF THE
JEWISH PEOPLE THROUGHOUT THE HISTORY OF THE CHURCH

Harold H. Ditmanson

My assignment in this paper is to describe "The Influences which Have Affected Our Understanding of the Jewish People Throughout the History of the Church." The emphasis should fall upon the extra-biblical factors that have shaped our thinking about the Jewish people. These factors are the dogmatic theology of the church and the cultural tradition of the West. This is an important topic, both in its content and in its presuppositions. Its presuppositions, in particular, invite us to undertake a study in which we must open our minds and be willing to expose ourselves to ideas that are both complicated and threatening to our self-esteem as gentiles and as Christians.

The statement of the topic presupposes that there is an extra-biblical source of Christian thought. We regard the Bible as the Word of God because it transmits to us the content and meaning of God's self-disclosure in Christ. Any theology which claims to be Christian theology must maintain close and positive relations with the Bible. Yet the Bible has a developing theological tradition as its complement. This tradition keeps in close touch with its biblical sources, but goes beyond the Bible in its effort to answer questions, to conform the answers to growing knowledge, and to adapt the answers to the thinking of every new age. Tradition has its undeniable place in helping to determine the doctrine and practice of the church. Yet, although it intends to be the collective and developing interpretation of the Bible, the theological tradition is often thought to have diverged from the teachings of the Bible. Tradition can misinterpret the Bible and introduce into theology certain elements that are unbiblical and sub-Christian. The failure of tradition to be thoroughly Christian becomes both obvious and tragic as we consider the influences that have shaped our thinking about the Jewish people.

The statement of the topic also presupposes that there is an extra-Christian source of ideas and attitudes held by Christian people. The Bible does not provide all the knowledge possessed by the Christian man. Knowledge comes from many sources and the mind of a Christian always contains a mixture of thoughts that derive from the revelational tradition and thoughts that flow from human observation and reasoning. (How to relate these two sources of knowledge is the essence of the problem of "faith and reason") As the church interacts with the surrounding cultural tradition, it absorbs and utilizes many elements that are rational, constructive and humane. But it also absorbs elements that are irrational, destructive, and inhumane. The fabric of cultural life is a composite of good and bad and the church's own tradition is a composite one. It is always necessary therefore, to examine that tradition in order to purge it of elements that are unbiblical and sub-Christian (ecclesia reformata sed semper reformanda).

Since the long and massive Christian tradition is necessarily composite and eclectic, we can see that when we ask about "our understanding" of the Jewish people, we have two positions in view. If by "our understanding" we mean the biblically-based, authentic Christian attitude toward the Jewish people, then we find it set forth in Paul's theology of Israel. Paul maintains a delicate balance between negative and positive factors. The Law is transitory and preparatory in character and is terminated in Christ. The burden of the Law is replaced by the freedom of the Gospel which declares that salvation is found in faith in Christ, which

is the fruit of grace. Yet God does not cast off his people, even though they have failed by their unbelief. They have stumbled, but not fallen and in the fullness of time they will return. Paul grieves for his kinsmen who "are most dear for the sake of the fathers" and who are still the recipients of "the gifts and the call of God" (Galatians, Romans). Paul's attitude involves an affirmation of the truth of the Gospel, a distinction between Christianity and Judaism, and a policy of respect and benevolence toward Jews.

The Pauline doctrine of separation and benevolence set the primary and authentic attitude of the church toward the Jewish people. The balance between negative and positive elements, however, was not maintained. Desperate circumstances caused the theme of Judaism's replacement to overshadow the attitude of respect, benevolence, and hope. Yet Paul's doctrine has been the normative Christian understanding of the Jewish people and although it has been distorted all too often, it has never been completely submerged.

In the sixth century, Pope Gregory I used his enormous power and prestige to affirm the Pauline doctrine. In his letters to bishops he directed that the legal rights of the Jews, granted in the Theodosian Code, were to be respected. Their religious practices were not to be interfered with. Gregory opposed Judaizing tendencies and urged his bishops to work for the conversion of Jews to Christianity. But such conversions were never to be accomplished by force or fear but only by gentleness and persuasion. Gregory was not by any means free from negative stereo-types of the Jews, but he did insist upon the Pauline teaching of special affection for Israel and approached Jewish people with justice and love.

During the early Middle Ages there was no popular hostility toward Jews, although there were legislative enactments designed to protect Christians from contacts with Judaism that might lead to defection from the church. The salvation of souls, Christian and Jewish, was the central aim of the church. Christians were to be protected from apostasy and Jews were to be urged to enter the church at the same time that they were to be free to practice their own religion. There was certainly a tension between opposition to Judaism as a rival religion and protection of the basic rights of Jews. But the protective policy formulated by Pope Gregory and expressed in the Theodosian Code predominated and continued to exert its influence in later centuries. Conditions varied from one country to another and it is clear that popes adhered to the Pauline-Gregorian policy with greater fidelity than did local bishops and councils.

The general current was toward a steady deterioration of the image and situation of the Jews, and only exceptional personalities could keep the Pauline doctrine alive. Yet, the doctrine did remain alive and was strongly reasserted in 1964 in the L zgumkloster Declaration of the Lutheran World Federation and in the Second Vatican Council's Declaration on the Relationship of the Church to Non-Christian Religions. In these documents there is a recognition of the deicide charge, and a rejection of hatred and persecution of the Jews.

It can be said that this Pauline doctrine is a major influence in shaping "our understanding" of the Jewish people. Yet we all know that his normative Christian understanding has been observed more in principle than in practice. In practice other influences have shaped the attitudes of Christians, for the history of the church is also the history of Western culture within which the church has lived. These other influences are diverse and represent human thought and conduct which have scarcely been affected by the presence of thoughtful and just Christians.

Thus, we must mean by "our understanding" not only the normative attitude of the church but also the general attitude, or set of attitudes, of a whole population or of an historical epoch. We must take "our understanding" to mean the general understanding of Western man because the membership of the church overlaps the economic, political, social, and intellectual segments of the human community. The same people are Christians, workers, bankers, citizens, governors, scholars, writers, scientists, artists, rabble-rousers, and neurotics.

The testimony of history shows that the formal profession of Christian faith does not guarantee that a person will understand or obey the normative biblical or theological tradition. Such a person may well combine Christian profession with attitudes on many topics that are not Christian at all, but simply borrowed from the surrounding world. But even if the sincere profession of Christian faith is combined with careful Christian understanding and responsible Christian conduct, there is no guarantee that Christians will move directly from the Gospel to a unified moral posture and social policy. Even if such unity or uniformity among Christians were desirable, it appears to be a goal that the world will not allow the Christian mind and spirit to achieve. The fact is that Christian ethics has exhibited varying degrees of unity and has expressed differing forms of piety. This variety is to be observed in the early Christian churches, in the Eastern churches, in medieval and modern Roman Catholicism, in the right and left wings of the Reformation, down through the Enlightenment to the diverse types of Christian ethics in our own time. Christians have been found both supporting and opposing monarchy, democracy, socialism, monasticism, theocracy, pietism, revivalism, pacifism, and so on. Each type of ethics, piety, or social position has believed itself able to find authorization in the Bible or in the early church. The history of Christian ethics, like Christian theology, is a history of the conversations within and between the "families" of Christian piety, and also between certain of these "families" and groups outside the church. Neither Christian ethics nor Christian theology, therefore, can take on a final form in which we can rest once and for all. We must both criticize our "mixed" tradition and find new ways of responding to the creative and redemptive power of God.

In the case of "our understanding", both as church members and as citizens of the West, of the Jewish people, we must acknowledge that the normative Christian tradition has been unable to direct the behavior of the general population. Moreover, it is clear that the behavior of many Christians shows the intrusion within the churches, from extra-ecclesiastical sources, of highly destructive patterns of thought and conduct.

We will turn first to an examination of the attitudes toward the Jewish people which are to be found in the joint-history of the church and Western culture, and then to a study of the influences which have produced these attitudes. The theological and historical material is so great that both attitudes and influences must be arranged under broad classifications. We will consider attitudes that are religious, social, economic, political, and ethnic in character. We will then study influences under the following headings: biblical, theological, competitive, political, economic, and psychological.

Attitudes

Religious

Alongside the Pauline view that Judaism had been replaced by the church, but that it was yet to be treated with respect, benevolence, and hope, there soon appeared attitudes that were much less positive in character. By the end of the third century, the Jew was seen by Christians in general as an unbeliever, although an unbeliever of a special type. The Letter of Barnabas shows at some length that the Jews misunderstood the Old Testament. Justin, Tertullian, Eusebius and Origen complain frequently about Jewish insults to the person of Christ and about evidences of Jewish hatred for Christianity. By the end of the fifth century, Christians saw the Jew as a blind, perverse, obdurate, guilt-laden unbeliever, resistant to grace and a destroyer of souls. The medieval Christian saw the Jew as one who was actually convinced of Christian truth but stubbornly withheld his belief. During the 13th century, the Jewish refusal to accept the church was blamed on the Talmud, which was seen as a book of anti-Christian hatred. As a result, the Talmud was publicly condemned by kings, bishops, and popes and great quantities were burned. Also in the 13th century, charges that Jews had desecrated a host circulated in France and Germany. As a result of mob-action, 100,000 Jews were murdered and 140 cities destroyed in the Rindfleisch massacres. Church and state were unable to control the superstitious zealotry of the mobs, and the host desecration charge led to further atrocities against Jews in the 14th, 15th, 16th and 18th centuries.

As an unbeliever, the Jew was seen as an object of mission. Ignatius contented that the church is, and always was, the true Israel. Judaism, therefore, is obsolete. The Epistle to Diognetus describes Jewish religious practice as "hypocrisy" and "silliness". The Apologists saw Judaism as a pretender, an apostate nation, no longer playing the role of chosen people. Cyprian, Jerome and others blame the Jews for their disobedience, but do so with a note of sadness and are hopeful for reunion. Zeal for the conversion of Jews to Christianity became a fixed element in church policy. The practice of compulsory attendance at Christianity became a fixed element in church policy. The practice of compulsory attendance at Christian sermons was known in the ninth century, became widespread in the thirteenth century, was formalized by the Council of Basel in the fifteenth century, and continued off and on until it was abolished in 1848.

The rapid deterioration of the Jewish image and status during the fourth century was due to an ominous addition to the picture of the Jew as a special type of unbeliever. Justin was the first to express the idea that Jews are a people punished for the crime of deicide. Hippolytus and Origen soon expanded the theme of deicidal punishment. No early theologian equalled John Chrysostom in his rage against the Jews. At the heart of his denunciations is the thesis that the supreme crime of deicide cannot be forgiven and that all the troubles which come upon Jews are the expression of divine rejection and vengeance. The belief in the deicidal guilt of the Jews and their punishment was taken for granted during the Middle Ages and succeeding centuries. The image of the Jews as "Christ-killers" was an essential part of the pogroms and forced emigrations of the 19th century.

Christian attitudes toward Jews are surely negative if Jews are seen as unbelievers, targets of conversion, Christ-killers, and objects of divine

punishment. But even worse was the image of the Jew as a ritual murderer. Jews were first accused by Christians of ritual murder in the 12th century and it has been repeated in every century thereafter. It is the most damaging instrument of persecution devised in the Middle Ages and to its account must be laid many of the tortures, imprisonments, expulsions, confiscations, and massacres of that and later ages. Scholarship has repudiated the historicity of all the so-called murders.

From the pen of Gregory of Nyssa we have an eloquent example of the kind of abuse which established the Jew as the object of Christian hatred. He describes the Jews as "slayers of the Lord, murderers of the prophets, enemies of God, adversaries of grace, advocates of the devil, brood of vipers, slanderers, scoffers, leaven of the Pharisees, congregation of demons, sinners, wicked men, and haters of goodness" (Homilies on the Resurrection, 5). John Chrysostom's Antioch sermons went far beyond all others in his denunciations, and we are not surprised to hear him say that it is the duty of Christians to hate the Jews. Chrysostom's influence was great on the populace and the clergy and a generalized popular hatred of the Jew spread rapidly. Erasmus of Rotterdam said much later: "If it is Christian to hate the Jews, then we are all good Christians."

Social

It has been the lot of the Jew since pre-Christian times to bear the image of an unassimilated stranger. The book of Esther reflects the classical reaction to the Jewish refusal to commingle and to worship national gods (3:8). The Greeks and Romans noticed that the Jews did not take their place as average citizens of the cities and towns. This aloofness seemed to them to be an insufferable arrogance. The strongly Hellenized population of Alexandria resented the Jewish refusal to accept common religious and social standards. Tacitus surpassed all others in denouncing the Jew as an "unsociable animal". Jewish separatism, intolerance, and aloofness generated in the classical mind first contempt, then anger, and finally hatred.

The anti-social image of the Jew was transmitted to Christians living in the Greco-Roman environment, and appears as a standard item in Christian writings. The ghetto was ancient and the church had consistently encouraged the voluntary separation of Christians and Jews. But in the 16th century the old "Jewish quarter" was made into a ghetto under lock and key. The ghetto was a way of saying that the Jew was strange and should be segregated. It was an alternative to expulsion on the one hand and freedom on the other. The note of foreignness has consistently marked the Jew for ostracism in every nation.

Economic

During the patristic period, Jews did not differ greatly from their neighbors in occupation, although it was at this time that the accusation of Jewish addiction to commerce originated. Jerome, Ambrose, Chrysostom, and Cyril of Alexandria make the first accusations. The number of Jews in commercial enterprises did increase, but slavery laws, special taxes, and exclusion from other occupations forced them toward commerce. Chrysostom is up to his

usual form in describing Jews as "rapacious, greedy, perfidious bandits."

By the 13th century, many circumstances had pushed the Jew toward involvement in usury. After the First Crusade, money became an essential ingredient of the new economy. The church's ban on usury kept Christians from moneylending, but the church itself connived at the Jews' practice of usury. Not only did gentiles need the Jewish moneylender, but the Jew himself needed money in order to stay alive in a hostile society. But resentment toward Jewish usury grew among the rich and the poor and eventually expulsions and massacres were to flow from economic motives. The destruction of lists of debts owed to Jewish creditors either before or after a massacre prove the point.

Poor people tended to blame their own poverty on Jewish financiers to whom they attributed the high cost of living. As a new capitalism made moneylending less important, many Jews moved into commerce and gained monopolies in the few trades open to them. Thus they were exposed to new charges of sharp business practices and dishonesty. Jewish success in business prepared the ground for the charge of a world-wide financial conspiracy. This image played an important role in the 19th century. As the prestige of the church declined, the deicide charge was largely supplanted by the image of the Jew as an unassimilable economic parasite.

Political

Political attitudes toward the Jew were like economic, social, and religious attitudes, in the sense that he was again caught in the middle. He was both wanted and unwanted. But as time went on, negative aspects overshadowed positive aspects, and the image of the Jew deteriorated. Jews had long been familiar with restrictive legislation, even though the Roman emperors gave them special privileges were abolished and the Jew's civil status was precarious. By the 5th century the Jew was still a citizen protected by law, but was merely tolerated as a second-class citizen. Medieval law extended fundamental justice to Jews and exceptional rulers of state and church protected their right to worship. Yet medieval society degraded Jews as social outcasts and forced them into involvement with usury, thus making them vulnerable to political persecution.

The centuries of rising nationalism developed an image of the Jew as an enemy of the state. Jews refused to dissolve their unique identity into any national melting pot. The note of foreignness had already brought upon Jews the suspicion of complicity with Islam during the time of the Crusades. In 16th century Poland, Jews were suspected of being in league with the Turks. As early as 1321, thousands of Jews were massacred in France on the charge that they had conspired with the king of Tunis and other infidel rulers to exterminate Christianity. The idea of a Jewish world conspiracy remained in the European mind and came to disastrous fruition in the 20th century Protocols of the Learned Elders of Zion. The Protocols revealed plans for Jewish world conquest. They were completely discredited in 1921, yet continued to create hatred toward Jews in many countries. Henry Ford gave them wide circulation in the United States. They reached their peak of influence in Nazi Germany. Super-patriots in many countries portrayed Jews as radicals and revolutionaries who sought to use democracy as a tool for destructive purposes.

Moral-Ethnic

Under this category we can place all attitudes to Jews that picture them as inferior people - mentally, morally, and racially inferior. The classical mind saw Israel as an oddity. Jews were given to strange customs and superstitions: dietary restrictions, circumcision, the Sabbath. Classical references to the foolishness and wickedness of these "strangers" were repeated by the church fathers, some of whom reached heights of ingenuity and eloquence in heaping insults upon Jews. Chrysostom, as usual, is in a class by himself and furnished succeeding ages with a rich catalogue of abuse. In the 19th century, bishops Agobard and Amulo repeat and expand Chrysostom's attacks upon the mental and moral capabilities of Jews.

In 15th century Spain, due partly to the influx of converted Jews (Marranos) into church and society, an obsession with the purity of Spanish blood led to the charge that the evil in Judaism and Marranism had its source in "bad blood" -- hereditary Jewishness. The Jew has now become an ethnic problem, as well as a theological, social, economic, and political misfit.

Late in his life, Luther wrote a tract on the Jews which repeated the common stock of insults, but excelled most of them in sarcasm and violence. Voltaire, the enemy of superstition, approved the endless persecutions of the Jews, calling them barbarous, ignorant, and imbecilic. But it was in the 19th century that the theory of social inferiority came to full flower. Jews were seen as physically, morally, and culturally inferior to the Aryan race. In the Dreyfus case, the Jew has ceased to be an individual human being and has become symbolic of everything evil. Nazi anti-Semitism went beyond even the racialism of the Dreyfus case in picturing the Jew as uniquely evil, the cause of every human problem, and a fit object of genocide.

In concluding our survey of attitudes and images, we must note that although the term "scapegoat" is seldom, if ever, used in religious and cultural denunciations of the Jew, the reality of the attitude or image is there, perhaps in the subconscious. Citizens of the West, including Christians, have been conditioned to find in the Jew a ready-made scapegoat. This is nothing new. In the Greco-Roman world, once the Jew was singled out from other groups by his refusal to conform to national and social standards, he fell prey to every complaint that could be devised by ignorant, disappointed, and disordered minds. As Edward Flannery puts it, the Jews "served as a target for all the frustrations of the pagan soul" (The Anguish of the Jews, page 23). This can be said also of Western man. Once the actual, living Jew had been swallowed up in the imaginary constructs of Jews, it was almost inevitable that medieval and modern man, suffering social and political hardships, financial and military reverses, and natural calamities, would find in the Jew the scapegoat needed to rationalize his disappointment and frustration.

Influences

The scapegoat theme serves as a transition to a survey of the influences or causes that have shaped our thinking about the Jewish people.

Biblical

Although our interest is in extra-biblical materials, we should at least take note of some New Testament foundations. Jesus asserted his priority to Abraham, announced himself as the sole way to the Father, proclaimed the self-disclosure of God in his career to be the fulfillment of Israel, and sent his followers out to "make disciples of all nations" (Matt. 10:6; 5:17; John 8:58; Matt. 28:19). In response to these teachings, the first Christian church was a Jewish church in leadership, membership, and worship even though the impact of Jesus was to break the mold of traditional religion. Peace between church and synagogue was soon replaced by tension. As Paul pondered the meaning of the unity and the difference, he developed a theology of Israel which struck a balance between separation and benevolence. As we have already seen, the Pauline doctrine survived the centuries, despite almost total eclipse at times, and has shaped the few bright moments in the history of Jewish-Christian relationships.

Theological

The theological tradition of the church is very complex. It speaks about an endless variety of topics with varying degrees of coherence and authority. No Christian should want to be held responsible for everything that passes under the name of "theology". It is a human and fallible enterprise in constant need of critical revision. It is important to distinguish between theology that represents the indispensable commitments of the church and theology that expresses the speculations of individual theologians. At the risk of oversimplification, it can be suggested that a distinction be made between dogmatic and applied theology. By dogmatic theology I mean the interpretation of those revealed truths which stand at the core of theology and without which there would be no Christian faith at all - the triune God, creation, man's need of redemption, incarnation, atonement, and eschatology. By applied theology I mean the expression of Christian faith in concrete existence, in the institutional and ethical aspects of the life of faith. Applied theology is practical, reactive, and polemical in relation to other faiths.

In the area of dogmatic theology, the church has given its most central, corporate, and definitive attention to the doctrines of the Trinity and the Incarnation. The 3rd century writings of Cyprian, Hippolytus, and Origen show that in this area an exposition of the Christian faith demanded a detailed refutation of Judaism. During the first four centuries in general, theology in its dogmatic phase expounded a critique of Judaism that was considered essential to the Christological dogmas of the church. This is not the place for a detailed study of Nicene and Chalcedonian theology. But we should take note of the motivation and logic that drove Christians to engage in a refutation of Judaism.

Israel affirmed the truth that there is one God, the only God, beside whom there is no God (Deut. 6:4). For the Christians, too, God is one. But there was a fundamental difference between the Christian belief in one God and Jewish monotheism. Christians affirmed the unity of God but could not think of a simple mathematical oneness, because the events of history were too strong for theology. Their experience of God in Christ led them to take account of the fact that the living God had now acted, and was continuing to act, in ways which made it no longer possible to think of him in terms of the simple arithmetical unity which the revelation in Israelite history seemed to imply. The followers of Jesus, reflecting on the meaning of what he did and said,

realized that when he acted and spoke they were confronted with nothing less than the acts and words of God. In him God was at work. The early Christians were thus faced with the problem of expressing in intelligible terms their belief that, though God is one and there is no other God, yet in Jesus there was a new and unique expression of God in terms of a genuinely human life. The writers of the New Testament used the ancient Hebrew concepts of "Wisdom" and "Word" to express their belief that Jesus must be fully divine while retaining their Jewish monotheism. Terminology was evolved by which it was said that the Son is of one and the same essential being as the Father, yet is to be distinguished as another personal mode of that one being.

Christians were later led to the conclusion that the Spirit which inspired and motivated their lives as individuals and as a group was no less than God, working within and among them. Christian experience was thus Trinitarian, in the sense that in it one and the same Living God was disclosed in three eternal aspects or modes. It was important to the early theologians to say that if this revelation is real, and not merely some kind of disguise behind which there still remains a totally unknown God, then it follows that these aspects or modes of God's activity towards his creation are aspects or modes of his essential being. They are not parts played by God to different audiences. They are what God himself is.

The doctrines of the Incarnation and the Trinity were seen as reciprocal. If Christians did not affirm the Incarnation, they would not be able to believe that the revealed God was identical with the essential, real, and actual God. And if they could not believe this, then their experience of salvation was an illusion.

So long as the dogmatic theology of the patristic period occupied itself with the doctrines of the Incarnation and Trinity, there was nothing in it to bear negative influence upon Christian thinking about the Jewish people. It was consistent with the Pauline policy of marking Christianity off from Judaism but regarding Jews with respect and affection and treating them with benevolence.

When we turn to applied theology, a different picture emerges. A theological offensive against Judaism was launched which progressively took the form of the refutation and debasement of the people the church claimed to have replaced. The church's bid for acceptance in the empire during the first three centuries met a strong challenge in a Judaism that refused to die. Signs of irritation and alarm can be seen in the Apologists as they tried to prove to the gentiles that the church was the true Israel and Judaism was a mere pretender. Theologians and preachers drew upon standard anti-Jewish charges and by the 4th century the denigration of Jews had assumed a dogmatic character. Chrysostom feared that some of his parishioners might convert to the Jewish faith and did his best to create in Christians a fear and disgust of Judaism. A rigidly verbal method of biblical interpretation took every negative reference to Jews in the Old Testament at face value. In the 13th century, a literalistic exegesis was used by theologians and councils to show that Paul's doctrine of Christianity's spiritual superiority over Judaism should be translated into canons and codes forbidding Jews public office and prescribing various forms of servitude. The failure of Julian the Apostate to rebuild the Temple in Jerusalem in 363 A.D. was seen by many early theologians as a direct intervention of God to perpetuate Judaism's punishment and as a fulfillment of New Testament texts.

There is much evidence to show that when churchmen sought to give religious and moral guidance in an unruly world and to cope with a rival faith and with unreliable rulers, they expressed in their practical theology a great body of opinion that was based not on the Bible or on the central dogmas, but was the product of bad exegesis, eccentric interpretations of historical events, malicious misinformation, and personal frustration. The theme of deicidal punishment, in particular, furnished a pseudo-theological basis throughout many centuries for degradations of the Jews.

Competitive

As we have already seen, the element of competition had much to do with the anti-Jewish character of practical, institutional, or applied theology. The church's debate with Judaism during the first three centuries was the result of an intense rivalry. The church considered Judaism obsolete, yet its appeal to the public caused strong Judaizing tendencies in the church, its proselytizing continued, and Jews were associated with several of the Christian heresies. The bitterness of anti-Jewish writings must be seen in the light of severe competition between Judaism and Christianity.

Chrysostom was clearly alarmed at the extent of Judaizing among his flock, some of whom were visiting synagogues and Jewish homes. Anti-Jewish legislative measures taken by both the church and the empire were a translation into statutory form of what patristic teaching seemed to call for. Evidence that Judaism was alive and a threat to the church is provided by the canons of church councils from the 4th to the 13th centuries.

Political

Political factors have always functioned as an important influence in shaping our thinking about the Jewish people. Jews have been the victims of both ecclesiastical and secular political motives. On the ecclesiastical side, Jews have been seen as the final roadblock to the religious unity of Christendom. Once paganism and the Christian heresies were brought under control, it was the durability of Judaism that frustrated hopes of unity. The long history of forced conversions, which reached its peak in the Spain of Ferdinand and Isabella, speaks eloquently of the medieval urge to enforce religious and cultural unity. Whenever a new unity of Christian faith appeared on the horizon, the Jews in their uniqueness - chiefly religious - were singled out for attention.

The state was no less interested in unity than the church. From the 6th to the 10th centuries, in both East and West, Christianity was so closely knit to the socio-political order that Jewish unbelief was deemed something of a crime against the state. In France, numerous councils decreed that Jews were not to hold public office or to wield any authority over Christians, since a Jewish civil functionary would be a contradiction in terms within a unified Christendom. In Spain, the Jews stood in the way of a political unification of the country from the 7th to the 15th centuries. In most countries, the Jew, as a special kind of infidel at the heart of Christendom, dashed hopes of a unified Christian order. By the 18th century, Russia found itself governor of the largest body of Jews in the world. Catherine II confined the Jews within "the Pale". But during the next two centuries, emperors decided that the only solution to their "Jewish problem" was the Russification of the Jews. Similar discomfort over the presence

of the Jews can be seen in eastern Europe throughout the 20th century. When they held to their own religious and cultural identity against the rising tide of nationalism, they drew upon themselves a kind of political animosity that used religious, social, and economic stereotypes to rationalize its efforts to destroy Jewish solidarity.

Economic

The influence of economic factors in shaping our attitudes toward the Jewish people has already been mentioned and hardly needs elaborate documentation. As early as the First Crusade, Christians became more active in commercial affairs and began to resent Jewish competitors. Jews were forced into usury and were then resented as usurious unbelievers. The economic motive was seldom absent in the widespread trials, expulsions, and massacres of the 14th century. Pope Sixtus IV said of the Spanish Inquisition's persecution of the Jews in the 15th century that "avarice and lust for gain" motivated the tribunal more than zeal for the salvation of souls.

When banks failed in France and Austria-Hungary in the 19th century, Jews were blamed and revenge was sought against them, even though the failures stemmed from poor business practices on the part of the banks. During the 20th century, economic depressions have resulted in persecutions in almost all countries with Jewish communities. The high mark of anti-Jewish feeling in the United States was ushered in by the depression of 1929.

Psychological

A sharp distinction cannot be made between the psychological influences and the other factors we have mentioned. The theological, political, social, and economic causes of anti-Jewish attitudes are all apprehended and expressed through the psychological equipment of human beings. But it is necessary to acknowledge that many attitudes and incidents seem to spring almost directly from feeling that are unaffected by somewhat objective standards of thought and morality. When we look not only at anti-Jewish phenomena but at the whole life of a man in society and observe the malign forces that throw things into confusion, we are tempted to say that the springs of human action lie deep in ignorance and madness.

But if it is too much to say that the whole of life is at the mercy of meaningless ponder the enigmatic character of the world and the impenetrable mystery of evil. A few examples may be given of the random, irrational, uncontrollable events that have brought suffering to the Jewish people.

In the year 1000, the Jews were in reasonably stable conditions. But the stability was soon to be broken by the most disastrous massacres. Christians lived in a state of constant fear. The turn of the millenium inspired an apocalyptic awe, centralized government was gone, the prestige of the papacy was at low ebb, and the Moslem enemy was at the gates. In this state of mind, the Crusades set off to free the Holy Land in 1096, but they massacred the Jews as they went along. The perpetrators of the massacres were the "poor men", who formed an advance guard for the more disciplined crusaders. Ignorant men were whipped into a state of frenzy by fear, frustration, and religious fanaticism, and inhuman cruelty was the result. The Christian conscience was

deeply troubled, yet in the wake of the massacres, popular hostility toward the Jews increased, as though it was necessary for ignorant men to believe that the atrocities must have been deserved.

In 1336, one of two noblemen, the Armleder, believed he had received a call to avenge the death of Christ by murdering the Jews. Thousands of people followed these demented leaders and slaughtered Jews in the Rhineland. Church and state were impotent against such superstitious mobs. Time and again the Jews were the victims of the breakdown of rationality and civilized order. When the Black Death struck in 1347, Jewish communities all over Europe were torn to pieces by crazed mobs. People lashed out in their bewilderment and found in the Jew the cause of their sufferings. In these same years, a group of "Flagellants" roamed throughout Germany and France, expiating their sins by stirring up attacks on the Jews. The fanatics were condemned by church and state, but not before the damage was done. In general, anti-Jewish activity during the medieval period was a mob phenomenon.

Those who suffer at the hands of mobs have special reason for amazement and bitterness. But the condition is not much improved when the senseless malice and destruction are the product of deliberate and organized action. In 15th century Spain, leaders of church and state encouraged a veritable obsession with purity of blood, by which they meant freedom from the taint of Jewish blood transmitted by converts to Christianity. The irrational element is strong in any belief that Jewish blood is inherently and uniquely defiled.

The theory of racial inferiority which was proposed by a host of so-called intellectuals in the 19th and 20th centuries played an important role in setting the Jew apart as the scapegoat for troubles that France and Germany were to face. To say that such a theory is the expression of prejudice or ignorance is too kind. It is a compound rather of malice and craziness. The paranoid character of anti-Jewish theories and actions is clearly illustrated by the Dreyfus case. The widespread influence of the Protocols of the Learned Elders of Zion, despite the glaring absurdities contained therein, shows once again that Jews have been the victims not of God or of human justice, but of a collective psychosis. The climax of unreason and hatred was reached, of course, in the Nazi ideology.

CONCLUSION

We have seen that "our understanding" of the Jewish people contains images and attitudes that are religious, social, economic, political, and moral-ethnic in character. We have also seen that biblical, theological, competitive, political, economic, and psychological influences have shaped these attitudes. Over the long stretch of history, these attitudes and influences have been negative, with periodic outbursts of savage hatred and violence.

Looking back over many centuries of negative thinking, persecution, and misery, one cannot avoid seeking explanations. Why have the Jews been the victims of such inhumanity? This is not the place for an extended study of the causes of anti-Jewish attitudes and actions, but some suggestions may be offered.

One forceful contemporary point of view regards the sociological, political, and economic influences as precipitating rather than as sufficient causes. In the search for a single explanation, this interpretation centers on theological and psychological factors. It traces hatred of the Jew to the inner forces of the soul and sees anti-Semitism as an anti-religious phenomenon. Revolt against God, repudiation of Christian morality, and rebellion against Christ cannot be expressed openly with any comfort even by those loosely-related to Christianity. So, through an unconscious displacement, the hostility is projected as a rejection of the Jew. From this rejection have derived in devious ways the many sociological, economic, political, and theological rationalizations that have motivated anti-Semites through the ages.

This interpretation has the advantage of finding a single cause of such depth that it accounts for the irrational, contradictory, and even diabolic character of anti-Jewish hatred. The theory may well be true. It is not too complicated or negative, even in what it says about the religious consciousness, to be outside the bounds of possibility. Yet, despite its simplicity and depth, one cannot know whether it is true or not. It remains a significant possibility or speculation which cannot be verified.

Another interpretation focusses not on Judaism, nor on the Jew as a person, nor on an unconscious rejection of Christianity, but on Jewish history in combination with the psychological drive to find a scapegoat. The irreducible starting-point of any explanation must be the fact that there is something in the style and situation of the Jewish people that has made them the inevitable scapegoat of Western civilization. So long as the world is a place in which life to the ordinary man means insecurity and frustration, so long will he need some scapegoat for his feelings.

For the individual and the group alike, the feeling of insecurity is aroused by the presence of something unfamiliar. Our first reaction to the novelty may be one of curiosity. If the suspicious present in our curiosity are not laid to rest, we develop a feeling of anxiety and even fear for ourselves, and, in proportion to this feeling, an attitude of suspicion, anger, and hatred toward the novelty. If the unfamiliar element becomes an equal, or even submissive, partner, it is incorporated into the society to which it was once strange. But if the novelty continues to retain a separate identity, then it becomes a permanent minority and is regarded with suspicion and hostility. Permanent differences in language, race, religion, culture, dress, and diet, can signify differences in mental attitude too deep for friendly and sympathetic communication.

When a typical minority situation emerges, fear and anxiety on both sides make rivalry and jealousy easier than respect and cooperation. Certain mechanisms of the human mind come into operation. The first of these is "projection", by means of which things we do not like in ourselves, and cannot accept, are projected on to others. So an unaccepted minority comes to fulfill the function in the majority group of being blamed for things which the majority has done or suffered. Sin, failure, famine, pestilence, political unrest, and other misfortunes have been transferred from the majority to the minority by projection. The minority was regarded as an enemy. Hatred became an excuse for further suspicions and guilt an excuse for further fears.

A second mechanism of the human mind is known as "displacement". In displacement we direct a pent-up emotion to an object other than its original target. We are afraid to "take it out" on the government, or the employer, so we "take it out" on someone or something more available. We blame a minority when things go wrong with us and we are unable or afraid to put them right ourselves.

When projection and displacement have embittered relations between individuals or groups, a third mechanism is used to soothe our consciences - "rationalization". We invent a justifiable "reason" for our own feelings, and a disreputable "reason" for the activities of the minority.

When a situation arises which calls these psychological mechanisms into play, it will be on an "identifiable stranger" or minority that they will be most likely to be discharged. Although many social, political, ethnic, and religious minorities have been used as scapegoats, no group can equal the Jews with respect to the duration, the geographical scope, the intensity, and the inevitability of persecution. It is clear from the evidence we have gathered that the Jews fill the role of "identifiable stranger" or minority almost to perfection. Their religion has isolated them from other nations and cultures. Flowing from their religious exclusivism there have been social, economic, and psychological differences to attract gentile attention. Jews have never entered as merchants or as industrial proletarians. Within cities they tended to concentrate into the few occupations and districts open to them. In these they quickly became prominent. Yet they have always been powerless since for nearly two thousand years the central factor of their environment has been dependence on others for their political situation and even their right of residence.

The tradition, the situation, and the powerlessness of the Jews have made them the perfect scapegoat. We have seen the evidence that both church and state, in seeking extraneous causes for frustrations and failures, have pounced upon the Jew as the ready-made scapegoat. Human nature is conservative and since men have been accustomed to blame the Jews, it is easier for sons to follow the customs of their fathers than to remove the causes of frustration or to find another scapegoat. In times of prosperity conflicts disappear from the surface, but if they are rooted in deep feelings of fear and jealousy and are established in custom, they do not dissolve but go underground. Old pictures of Jewish behavior, some religious, some social, some economic, linger in the memories of peoples who have persecuted Jews in the past. These past attitudes wait to be resurrected at a touch.

Perhaps the complex causes of Jewish suffering can be summarized in terms of three main factors. First, the Jews are the victims of human perversity. Second, they are the victims of their own peculiar place in Western history. Because they have been distinctive, they have been visible. Because they have been located in the vital centers of Western political and economic development, they have been defenseless. And because they have persisted in adhering to a "displaced" religion, their persecutors have been able to feel virtuous in attacking them. Third, the Jews are victims of the failure of Christianity to prevent the formation of negative images and to restrain prejudicial and violent behavior on the part of Christian people. Jesus' attitude of love for his people and Paul's doctrine of separation and benevolence have been normative but not effective. The same can be said for the secular doctrine of equality before the law.

The message from sensitized Christians to their brethren, inside and outside the church, is clear: repent of past misdeeds; revise the attitudes, literature, and practices that have produced harmful images of the Jews; and restore, so far as possible, to our Jewish neighbors what they have lost. Do we have any reason to be optimistic about the willingness of our fellows to hear this message?

" NO OTHER NAME "

Seven theses on the claim to the uniqueness of Christ
from the perspective of the Old Testament concept of God.

Magne Saebø

1. The theme "No other name" is so worded chiefly because of the key passage at Acts 4.12 which contains a Christological statement of faith, with a religious-polemical bias.

1.1. Any discussion of this theme that is based mainly on Biblical theology must find its proper starting point in Acts 4.12, not only because the theme owes its wording to that text but above all because here, as in other New Testament passages¹, the unique status of the name of Jesus is particularly clearly underlined. The passage should be evaluated in the context of Acts 4,1-22 and in the wider context of early Christian preaching.

1.2. In Acts 4,1-22 an account is given of Court proceedings conducted against Peter and John by the Council. Its most interesting part concerns the interrogation of the two men, and especially Peter's speech in their defense. From the theological standpoint, it seems significant that the question: "By what power or by what name did you do this?" (4,7) follows on the previously reported healing of a cripple (3,1-11), just as Peter's speech in his and John's defense (4,8-12) follows on his words about Christ (3,12-26), addressed to the crowd after the cripple had been healed. But it is also very important to note that the interrogation was due not to the healing itself but to the subsequent sermon on Christ to the crowd. The decisive point here is the acknowledgement of Christ as Lord, proclaimed by Peter and shared by him with the early Christian community.

1.3. In this confessing of the Christ the name of Jesus was focused (3,6.16; 4,10.12), as it was elsewhere (e.g. Acts 4,30; 5,41; 8,12; 9,15.27f; and also 2,36 and 5,31). This is due partly to the generally accepted essential unity of person and name and partly to the special form of the Christological proclamation. Yet the importance of the passage at 4.12 does not end with the concept of the name as such, but is principally apparent from a study of the way in which the name of Jesus is theologically described and applied in Acts 3 and 4 and also in other texts. Not only is a cripple healed (Acts 3,6.16; 4,7ff) "in the name of Jesus Christ of Nazareth", but sins are forgiven (10,43); in his name the Apostles start preaching (4,17f; 5,28.40; 8,12; 9,27f). The name of Jesus Christ is a powerfully effective force, lending the Christians authority and legitimacy in their work of healing, but above all in their task of preaching the Gospel. Moreover, they speak of Jesus' name in the same way that they speak of his person: Believing in him, they believe in his name (3,16) and are able to suffer indignity in his name (5,41). Similarly, mention of his name can easily switch over to statements related to his person: "In the name of Jesus Christ, whom you crucified, whom God raised from the dead...", 4,10; cf. 3,16) or directly include a Messianic passage - acknowledged by the Jews too - such as Ps. 118,22 (4,11). In the preaching of the early church, the name of Jesus is part of an elaborated Christology, which goes beyond Messianology in the restricted sense; this fact becomes clear in the different titles of majesty (Hoheitstitel) applied to Jesus (2,36; 4,27.30; 5,31)². The premise here and at the same time the central content, is the powerful awakening from the dead or resurrection of Jesus (e.g. 3,15f; 4,10; 5,30f; 10,40f).

The healing of the cripple (3,1-11; 4,7-10) points to the salvation of the world (in the religious sense) which the name of Jesus Christ alone guarantees (4,12)³.

1.4. The name of the crucified and risen Christ is alone capable of healing. With this claim to preach the only true religion, Peter confronted the highest representatives of his people. If the proclamation of Jesus' resurrection had provoked the Jews to opposition, the provocation could only be exacerbated still further by this claim to preach a religion that excluded all others. The Court's interrogation (Acts 4) developed into a religious argument, centered on the validity of the salvation in which the Jews of the synagogue believed and for which they hoped. The question of validity is related to the religious position and significance of Jesus, as a question concerning the saving presence of Israel's God of the Covenant; a decision could be reached only by acknowledgement or rejection of the claim that Jesus alone was capable of bringing salvation (cf. 5,28ff).

2. The Messianic-Christological claim of the early church to exclusivity, insofar as it is related to the saving significance of the name of Jesus, refers primarily to the revelation of Jahweh's name and to the rich theology of the name of God in the Old Testament; it can best be understood when related to its Old Testament origin, and therefore this relation should be discussed.

2.1. The revelation of Yahweh's name by Moses (Ex. 3 and 6) represented a very important turning point in the concept of God of the early Israelites, since the many names for God were then replaced by the one name which was a personal name and not just an appellative name. Through the one unique name, God became approachable and recognizable; through it, God manifested himself and made encounter with him possible for those who "call upon his name" (see, e.g. Gen. 12,8; 1.Kings 18,24). The name was a guarantee of his saving presence in worship and as a protector (cf. Ex. 20,24; 23,21; 33,19; 34,5f); the name thus "assumes in theology the place occupied by the image in other forms of worship." ⁴ Or the name could be used in a wider religious sense, for instance when Micah proclaimed, as if it were a creed: "We will walk in the name of the Lord our God, for ever and ever" (4,5). The name meant sanctuary, succour and salvation in God (cf. Ps. 20,3; 54,3; 23,3; 25,11; Prov. 18,10; Ps. 118,26; 129,8).

2.2. The name of Yahweh became a "synonym"⁵ for Yahweh himself and so the name was part of his sacredness. It could be "sanctified" in the same way as "the Holy One of Jacob" (Isa. 29,23) was sanctified, or it could be "profaned" (cf. Lev. 18,21; 19,12; 20,3). In this connection, "profaning" the name meant taking part in the worship of other gods, in any form whatever. "Further, to sanctify Yahweh's name was synonymous with acknowledging the uniqueness and the exclusive nature of the worship of Yahweh"⁶, and so it was of crucial importance not to "take the holy name of Yahweh in vain" (Ex. 20,7; Deut. 5,11), for the divinity and the divine honor of Yahweh were at stake (cf. Isa. 55,13; 59,19; Ps. 48,11; 102,16).

2.3. In Deuteronomic theology, the "dwelling" of God's name in the sacred place - in the Temple of Jerusalem (Deut. 12,5,11; 14,24; 1.Kings 8,27.29ff) - did not express the saving presence of Yahweh in worship in general, but in relation to one single place of worship. The prophetic promise made at a very much later date: "...that day shall there be one Lord, and his name one" (Zech. 14,9; cf. Deut. 6,4), is on the same lines. On the other side, in the priestly tradition of a later period, God's name could sometimes stand on its own, as an independent entity, so that one simply said "the name" when one

meant "the name of Yahweh" (Lev. 24,11.6), just as the Hebrew word hāśēm ("the name") was used by the Jews at a later date instead of the sacred tetragrammaton YHWH/Yahweh. In all of this, the use of God's name contributed essentially, from the theological standpoint, to the oneness and transcendence of God, and thus to Israel's decisive monotheism.

2.4. But the exclusivity of the religion of Yahweh was not only expressed through God's name itself and its use. It is evident in a number of ways in other parts of the Old Testament.

3. The claim of the Yahweh worshippers that theirs was the only God was something peculiar to the religion of the old Israelites, distinguishing it from the religions around them.

3.1. When Yahweh made himself known in person, in the words: "I am Yahweh" or "I am Yahweh, thy God" (the list of ways of identification could be extended), he was not, to be sure, doing something peculiar to the Yahweh religion; but because his self-presentation (Selbstvorstellung) happened chiefly in the context of the proclamation of sacred law in Israel and the recital of the great deeds of God for the protection and salvation of the chosen people (cf. Ex. 6,2ff; 20,2) ⁷, it became an expression of the "majesty of the sovereign Lord, who confronted man as his God" ⁸; it was also an expression of the special way of acting and self-revelation which Yahweh had practised in word and deed, so that in and through these he might be recognized and known. In this way, the use of self-presentation clearly promoted the special and exclusive quality of the religion of Yahweh.

3.2. However, the exclusive quality of the Yahweh cult is expressed even more strongly in the passages about Yahweh's "jealousy" or "holy jealousy" (see in particular Ex. 20,5; 34,14; Deut. 4,24; 6,14f; Josh. 24,19) ⁹. For the jealousy of Yahweh was specially emphasized when the worship of strange gods was being forbidden. The be-all and end-all were that Yahweh alone should be worshipped, and nothing had the right to interfere with this objective. In those days, the prohibition of the worship of any other gods was unique in the East. "Neighbouring religions do know the superiority of one god over another, but not this claim that there is only one God. Between the two attitudes lies a gulf which separates Israel from the early East" ¹⁰.

3.3. Moreover, there was often mention of Yahweh's jealousy in motivating clauses, such as the clause justifying the ban on images included in the Ten Commandments (Ex. 20,5; Deut. 5,9), a ban which, since it was primarily directed against images used in worship, therefore extends and reinforces the First Commandment, itself expressly directed against the worship of strange gods. ¹¹ Also, commandments of this kind were unknown to Israel's neighbors and could only give rise to surprise and exasperation there. "If the prohibition of the honoring of strange gods, at any rate in connection with the prohibition of images, was not known by the Israelites' neighbors, then one must see in it something peculiar to the Old Testament". ¹² Indeed, in this connection something more fundamental may be added about the worship of Yahweh: "Even independently of the attempt to make a comparison of religions at that point in history - a comparison which makes clear that religious intolerance was a hallmark of Yahweh worshippers - the First Commandment in the Old Testament appears as a kind of "program". God's requirements of Israel are summarized in that first commandment" ¹³. Effective shape is thus given to the hard claim of the Yahweh worshippers to worship the only true God. It is a claim made above all in the first two commandments and the third (which concerns God's name).

3.4. The claim of the religion of Yahweh that there was only one God was expressed in another way, in the form of a rhetorical question that compares Yahweh with others: "who is like unto Thee, O Lord, among the Gods?" (Ex. 15,11; cf. Ps. 18,32; 77,14; 89,7 etc.); the question expects a negative reply. In other passages the negative reply is given straight away: "There is none like God, O Jesh'urun" (Deut. 33,26; cf. e.g. 1.Sam. 2,2; 2.Sam. 7,22; 1.Kings 8,23). The comparison with others leads to the incomparability of Yahweh; above all, in relation to his great deeds it was proclaimed: There is none like or comparable with him.¹⁴

4. Due to the claim of exclusiveness, the religion of Yahweh took shape in the course of a hard, centuries-long struggle in which it partly rejected the multifarious religious beliefs of its neighbours and partly adapted them to its own needs.

4.1. The intolerant attitude of the Yahweh worshippers towards the religious concepts and practices of those around them stemmed from the facts described above, because the religion of Yahweh made the uncompromising claim that Yahweh alone was to be worshipped. For this reason the words "exclusio", "occupatio", and "degradatio" - used in referring to strange phenomena - have been chosen in an attempt to describe aptly the problem of "Yahweh and the gods"¹⁵.

4.2. For Israel, with its Yahweh worship, the situation of conflict followed from the settlement in Canaan. Perhaps the conflict was more "inward" than "outward"; for Israel did not want to fit tolerantly into the spiritual life of the country. Above all, the Israelites rejected - in an act of exclusio - the plurality of godheads, accepted in Canaan as a matter of course. Goddesses were not tolerated, nor was the customary raising of the sexual to the status of the divine: Israel bitterly opposed the fertility rites of Canaan in their various forms (cf. for instance Deut. 12,29-31; Hos. 2)¹⁶. As a result of this hostility, a series of concepts and practices of the everyday religious life of the country were eliminated as illegitimate. In many respects, Israel's worship of Yahweh was able to survive only through the rejection of what it found strange.

4.3. At the same time, the Israelites received much from the religions of those around them, but they adapted it in various ways to suit the special genius of the Yahweh cult. In the manner of an occupatio, the Israelites appropriated time-honored names and attributes of other gods and transferred them to Yahweh. Yahweh, not El, is the "most high God"; he is the true "King" and the "creator of Heaven and Earth" (cf. Gen. 14,18-22)¹⁷. Again, the powers which were thought to determine the destiny of men, were deprived of their power (cf. e.g. Ex. 15,11; Ps. 82,1; 89,7ff.); the result being a degradatio¹⁸.

4.4. Obviously all this did not happen overnight, but it came about only after a long history of revelation and tradition. If the Old Testament can be described as something akin to a battlefield, or still more accurately, as a cemetery of dead myths and silent gods - now that we see this better in the light of our greater knowledge of the ancient East - then it is true to say that this final triumph of the religion of Yahweh was made possible only through unremitting struggle. Without that struggle, the religion of Yahweh would not have been what it was and what it became.

5. The religious polemics against the strange and the disturbing were not conducted primarily against the strange gods but in order to maintain the faith of the people of Israel, who constituted the real battlefield. Yahweh's claim to be the only God meant a complete "appropriation" of the people, but this appropriation was largely weakened by syncretism.

5.1. The struggle and the polemics of those who believed in Yahweh were not an end in themselves but developed as a defensive response to the religious and cultural challenge in the country itself. Yahweh's claim to be the one true God - a claim unique in the ancient East - could only lead to a correspondingly unique situation of choice and decision for the Yahweh worshippers (cf. e.g. Josh. 24). Their adherence to Yahweh as Lord required their rejection of other gods and powers.

5.2. Now the Israelites were far from being the people of Yahweh which they ought to have been, ideally and "programmatically"; in countless ways they succumbed to the danger of conciliatory syncretism, although the fight against syncretism went on unabated. It would probably be true to say that the fight against syncretism in all its forms was Israel's real religious struggle. A number of groups of Yahweh worshippers took part in the struggle, for instance the "deuteronomists" (cf. Deut. 7,1ff; 10,12 etc.), former prophets such as Elijah (cf. 1.Kings 18) and latter prophets such as Amos and Hosea, Isaiah and Micah, Jeremiah and Ezekiel, whose unremitting reproaches and reprimands were, in effect, basically concentrated on proclaiming and achieving the worship and lordship of Yahweh alone (cf. e.g. Hos. 1-2. Amos 1-2; Isa. 1,10ff; 7,1-17; Mic. 3; Jer. 2,1ff; 7,3ff; Ezek. 8-11). These prophets were not creators of an "ethical monotheism" but renewers of old Yahwistic claims.

5.3. In the prophecies of the Deutero-Isaiah in the years of exile are gathered together many of the forms of speech and the theological aspects already discussed¹⁹. In the passages of disputation, sharp polemics against the gods is evident (cf. Isa. 40,12ff; 44,9ff; 46,5-8; also Ps. 115,3-8). In 46,5 and elsewhere, the incomparability of Yahweh is the subject: "To whom will you liken me and make me equal?"; and with the help of the self-presentation formula the exclusiveness of Yahweh is proclaimed: "I am the Lord, that is my name; my glory I give to no other, nor my praise to graven images." (42,8)

5.4. At the heart of the prophets' general eschatological message of salvation, as in their special utterances prophesying the coming of the Messiah, are the exclusivity and the unique lordship of Yahweh. These are, in fact, basis and goal of the message. Not even the coming of the Messiah revokes this main emphasis of the Old Testament concept of God. He tends to be portrayed as the regent in the Kingdom of God the Lord (cf. Isa. 9,1-2ff; Jer. 23, 1-6; Ez. 34,23f, etc.). Even if a renewed Zion is given a central place, it is Yahweh, revealed in all his glory, who is the real central figure (cf. Isa. 60,1ff).

6. The apparently neutral concept of God in the Old Testament wisdom literature is not to be contrasted with the exclusive faith in Yahweh, because the former too accepts the claim to exclusivity and in addition makes plain how wide in concept the Old Testament concept of God really was.

6.1. The teaching of wisdom in the Old Testament writings; Proverbs, Job and Ecclesiastes, together with certain other texts in the Old Testament, differ in a number of ways from the exclusive religion of Yahweh which we have been talking about up to now; for instance, in relation to the specifically Israelite ways already mentioned of expressing the belief in Yahweh, and to the particular sacred traditions deriving from Israel's story of salvation. In general the teaching of wisdom is far removed from the eschatology of the prophets and from priestly worship. It is more international and more universal than the theology of salvation that otherwise marks the Old Testament. It applies more to the individual and his everyday experiences and seems to be more rational²⁰.

6.2. However, it would be misleading to play off the wisdom literature, as developed and fitted into the Old Testament, against the Old Testament worship

of Yahweh, as has sometimes happened²¹, for undoubtedly the teachers of wisdom also claimed the right to speak of the God of Israel, though their point of departure and their concerns were different. The truth is that they developed and enriched the Israelite religion by proclaiming God chiefly as the God of creation and order and justice, and thus played a similar part to those who inveighed against false gods. No doubt the teaching of wisdom had its limitations - as had the cultic life in Israel - but it must nevertheless be regarded as a legitimate part of Old Testament theology, if only given its proper place in that theology as a whole.

6.3. Theologically, the teaching of wisdom is useful, *inter alia*, in revealing how much richer and wider is the Old Testament concept of God than people generally and traditionally like to think. Yahweh not only demotes the gods and powers and deprives them of their power but he himself positively possesses all power. The universe is his, as its creator and designer; and he is everywhere (cf. Ps. 139, 7-12).

7. The New Testament's relationship to the Old Testament is to be understood not only strictly christologically. The issue of God in the wider sense should be considered at the same time. For Jesus, who is not only the Messiah, the Christos, but also the Kyrios - like the Lord God of the Old Testament, without being identical with him - did, after all, confirm Israel's unique and rich concept of God and fulfill it by his life and suffering. He pursued Yahweh's claim to be the only true God.

7.1. By means of Peter's sermon in Acts 3-4, it has been shown (see 1.3 above) that Jesus and his name were proclaimed in a manner otherwise reserved for God. The evidence is to be found in many other passages of the Gospels and in the Epistles of Paul, and thus in New Testament christology it is possible to speak, in a way, of a "Yahwistic analogy", although this is not to be understood monistically.²² Moreover, the terms used in these writings are backed up by the titles of majesty used in describing Jesus, and above all from the appellation Kyrios²³.

7.2. Instead of trying to find "witness to Christ" everywhere in the Old Testament, it becomes possible to preserve the divine scheme of salvation contained in the Old and New Testaments, and to reflect that the historical "event" of Christ really seems to have been the culmination of the long, strife-ridden progress of God through the pages of the Old Testament. The story of revelation cannot be undone; rather it is to be understood in the light of its forward movement: Theologically this means that one cannot and should not seek to reach back behind a later stage of the historical tradition to an earlier stage as a more normative one, for the later stage incorporated the earlier ones²⁴. If the God who had become ever more widely and more fully known in Israel now revealed himself in Jesus Christ, it follows that "God in Christ" is, *ipso facto*, recognizable through Christ, in a new and final way.

7.3. On the other hand, Jesus Christ is to be understood in the light of the rich and complex concept of God in the Old Testament, where were found the categories and names by which the fullness of his revelation was defined, a revelation which was construed as the final eschatological revelation of God (John 1,1-18).

That is why God's salvation is said to be in his name and in no other.

NOTES

- 1) See 1.3. below; in the Pauline Scriptures esp. Phil. 2,9-11; cf. Bietenhard, in Kittels Theol. Wörterbuch (ThWNT), V, p. 272ff, with some more references.
- 2) Cf. O. Cullmann, The Christology of the New Testament, London, 1963; and F. Hahn, Christologische Hoheitstitel, Göttingen 1966.
- 3) E. Haenchen, Die Apostelgeschichte, Göttingen 1965, p. 177, characterizes Acts 4,12 as "die lukanische Form für die Behauptung der Absolutheit des Christentums".
- 4) Cf. G. von Rad, Theologie des Alten Testaments (ThAT), I, München 1958, p.185.
- 5) ThWNT, V, pp. 257,3ff; 260,6ff; cf. also W. Zimmerli, Grundriss der alttestamentlichen Theologie, Stuttgart 1972, p. 12ff.
- 6) Cf. von Rad, op. cit.
- 7) Cf. the papers by W. Zimmerli, "Ich bin Jahwe" (1953), now in his: Gottes Offenbarung. Ges. Aufsätze, München 1963, pp. 11-40; and by K. Elliger, "Ich bin der Herr - euer Gott" (1954), now in his: Kleine Schriften zum Alten Testament, München 1966, pp. 211-31. Cf. also W.H. Schmidt, Alttestamentlicher Glaube und seine Umwelt, Neukirchen-Vluyn 1968, pp. 53-58.
- 8) Cf. Zimmerli, Grundriss, p. 15.
- 9) Cf. esp. H.A. Brongers, "Der Eifer des Herrn Zebaoth", Vetus Testamentum, 13 (1963), pp. 269-84; also von Rad, ThAT, I (1958), pp. 203ff ("Das erste Gebot und Jahwes Eiferheiligkeit").
- 10) W.H. Schmidt, Glaube, p.75
- 11) Cf. W.H. Schmidt, Das erste Gebot, Theol. Existenz heute, 185, München 1969; also Schmidt, Glaube, pp. 68-83; von Rad, ThAT, I (1958), pp. 203-18; R. Knierim, "Das erste Gebot", Zeitschrift für die alttestamentliche Wissenschaft [ZAW], 77 (1965), pp. 20-39.
- 12) Schmidt, Glaube, p. 70.
- 13) Schmidt, op. cit.
- 14) See esp. C.J. Labuschagne, The Incomparability of Yahweh in the Old Testament, Leiden 1963; also W.H. Schmidt, Das erste Gebot, pp. 31-32; and S. Schwertner in: Jenni/Westermann, Theol. Handwörterbuch zum Alten Testament, I, col. 127-30.
- 15) This phraseology is coined by H.W. Wolff, "Jahwe und die Götter in der alttestamentlichen Prophetie", now in his: Gesammelte Studien zum Alten Testament, München 1973, pp. 418-41; cf. W.F. Albright, Yahweh and the Gods of Canaan, London 1968; H.D. Preuss, Verspottung fremder Religionen im Alten Testament, Stuttgart 1971; G. Schmitt, Du sollst keinen Frieden schliessen mit den Bewohnern des Landes, Stuttgart 1970.
- 16) Cf. von Rad, op. cit., p.36

- 17) Cf. W.H. Schmidt, Glaube, pp. 10-11, pp. 116ff and 126ff, with references to further relevant lit.; also M. Sæbø, Creator et Redemptor, in: Deus Creator, Bidrag til skapelsesteologien. Festschrift Ivar P. Seierstad, Oslo 1971, pp. 1-28.
- 18) Cf. also Labuschagne, pp. 66-123; and W. Schlisske, Gottessöhne und Gottessohn im Alten Testament, Stuttgart 1973; G. Cooke, "The Sons of (the) God(s)", ZAW 76 (1964), pp. 22-48.
- 19) Cf. i.a. C. Westermann, "Sprache und Struktur der Prophetie Deuterоjesajas", in his: Forschung zum Alten Testament, München 1964, pp. 92-170, esp. pp. 124ff.
- 20) Cf. i.a. G. von Rad, Weisheit in Israel, Neukirchen-Vluyn 1970; R.D.Y. Scott, The Way of the Wisdom in the Old Testament, New York, 1971; also H. Gese, Lehre und Wirklichkeit in der alten Weisheit, Tübingen, 1958.
- 21) Cf. H.D. Preuss, "Erwägungen zum theologischen Ort alttestamentlicher Weisheitsliteratur", Evangelische Theologie, 30 (1970), pp. 393-417; esp. his paper "Das Gottesbild der älteren Weisheit Israels", in: Studies in the Religion of Ancient Israel, Leiden 1972, pp. 117-145; also W. Brueggemann, "Scripture and an Ecumenical Life-Style. A Study in Wisdom Theology", Interpretation, 24 (1970), pp. 3-19.
- 22) Cf. Sverre Aalen, "Jesu kristologiske selvbevissthet. Et utkast til 'jahvistisk kristologi'", Tidsskrift for Teologi og Kirke, 40 (1969), pp. 1-18, now in his: Guds sønn og Guds rike. Nytestamentlige studier, Oslo, 1973, pp. 271-88.
- 23) Cf. Cullmann, pp. 195ff; Hahn, p. 68ff.
- 24) Cf. von Rad, IHAJ, II, 1965, pp. 309ff and 380ff; also H. Gese, "Erwägungen zur Einheit biblischer Theologie", now in his: Vom Sinai zum Zion, München, 1974, pp. 11-30.

"IN NO OTHER NAME"

Krister Stendahl

ACTS 4:5-12

When interrogated by the Jerusalem authorities about their miracle power (by what power and by/in what name, 4:7) Peter, full of holy spirit, answers: "Leaders of the people, and elders: When we today are being questioned about a good deed to a sick man (ch.3), as to by what means he has been healed, then it should hereby be made clear to you all and to the whole people of Israel: By the name of Jesus Christ the Nazarene, whom you crucified, whom God raised from the dead, by him this man stands before you safe and sound. This Jesus is the stone rejected with contempt by you, the builders, which has become a cornerstone. And there is no salvation by any other, nor is there any other name under the sun given to humankind by which we must be saved."

In no other name is there salvation but in the name of Jesus Christ.

Our theme is taken directly from Acts 4:12. Mr. Saebø has already brought this passage into exegetical focus, especially at the beginning of the end of his paper. I have chosen, as you will see in these fourteen short theses, a somewhat different approach. It is somewhat thin on exegesis, but it is rich on hermeneutical reflection. The reason for this choice of mine will become clear as we move on. My main feeling is that exegetically there is not too much to say about the verse. In fact so little that Conzelmann (in Handbuch z.N.T. 1963) in his most recent commentary on the Book of Acts has only one line about this momentous verse, which is to point out that the two Greek words for "other" (*allos* and *heteros*) mean the same thing in this verse. I have chosen rather to reflect upon how one as a Christian or how one Christian lives with the Bible, because there is a living relationship, an interplay, between the faith and the scriptures, and the church and the scriptures through the ages. It is naive (in the bad sense) to think that there is no such, but that the Bible is there as an objective given and that that settles all questions.

As to exegetical observations I agree with the two main ones made by Saebø, namely that we have in this passage religious polemic, i.e. a confessional statement sharpened up in the style and language of religious polemic. This was the starting point in Thesis 1 in Saebø's paper. Secondly, I agree with his strong emphasis that there is a striking parallelism in the structure between chapter 3 and chapter 4 of the Book of Acts. Personally, I get something very different out of this observation than does Saebø. He stresses the parallel between the Christ sermon in chapter 3 and the defensive speech for the healing in 4 to the effect that emphasis is placed on how preaching (*die Verkündigung*) is coupled with the miracles. This I think is an irrelevant Lutheran interpretation. Lutherans do find it hard to rest until they have said "Verkündigung", until they have spoken the word about preaching. To me, the difference between chapters 3 and 4 is a very different one: the attitude in speaking to the people (chapter 3) and the different attitude in speaking to the leaders of Judaism (chapter 4). Chapter 3 contains invitation, a gracious, pleading, friendly invitation; chapter 4, speaking to the leaders has nothing of the sort, and there is a sharp distinction between the people and the leaders, the Establishment.

I further find little awareness in this text or context of what Saebø referred to as the "Wesenseinheit von Person und Name" (the identity of person and name and all that goes with it). I find no speculations of any kind nor is there

any awareness of the relation between the name of Yahweh and the name of Christ present in the consciousness of Luke, as far as I can see - which leads me to my first thesis.

1) The Book of Acts pictures the apostles as wonder workers. This is in continuity with the praxis and the beliefs, especially populist, both in Judaism which had a strong tradition of wonder working, and in the Graeco-Roman culture. There is no other writing in the NT which is so colorful in its descriptions of Christian wonder working, and if you want a treat, go to Acts 19:11 ff. with the seven sons of Sceva and other colorful stories which most of us don't like to think about too much. We may be embarrassed to find that magic worked wonders for the Lord. What is wrong with Simon Magus (8:10) is only one thing, namely that he tries to buy the power of Christian magic, not that there is such. Acts is a book rich in vividly religious behavior gloriously practised by the early Christians, and it is all in the name of the Name. The phrase "to do something in the name of Jesus of Nazareth" is in all these passages related to the working of miracles. It is in the relation to the miraculous name-use, not in relation to the Shema that we must primarily read Acts 4:12 - by this Name is salvation. Luke uses the Name more than any other NT writer. The Name is Luke's special term for expressing the Christian gospel at work. It is also worth noting that in these passages the faith of those healed is seldom stressed. Thereby the wonder working effect of the Name is the more striking.

2) The question to which our topic - in no other name but Jesus - is part of the answer is found in Acts 4:7. It is the question of the temple authorities "By what power or by what name did you do this?" "This" seems to refer back to the healing in chapter 3, although it could include the speaking in the court of the temple. The answer does however refer back to the healing. As we know from other such accounts, it was very important for these Christians to stress that they did not do such miracles in their own name, but in the name of Jesus. See for example 3:12: "not as if we had done this in our own name."

Which leads me to thesis 3: that the primary and the simplest, the most obvious context of the words "In no other name is there salvation but in the name of Jesus" is: In the name of Jesus, and thus not in our own name. Pointing away from themselves, they made clear that they were not magicians within their own inherent powers. The power was in the name of Jesus. So that instead of answering all the questions of relations to other religions, the Jews, and all kinds of other things, the simplest level of this verse is: we didn't do it in our name but in the name of Jesus!

We may find such a minimalist exegesis almost unbelievably naive. We are all theologians and prone to milking words of the scriptures of their last drop of potential, but in listening to a story as Luke tells it, one should never miss that primary, the light and quick meaning.

4) But there is a second context, and that one is obviously the Jewish people. Here, as in chapters 2, 3 and the rest of 4, the addressees are Jews and in 4 most specifically the temple authorities. Nowhere in these chapters enter any questions about gentile gods, gentile cults or gentile religion. Thus there is no way of knowing whether Luke who wrote this would consider this saying relevant to a discussion on Buddhism - if he knew anything about Buddhism, which is most doubtful. The setting is intra-Jewish and inter-Jewish. The "no other name" has no extra-Jewish referent, nor would I consider it proper to "smuggle in" such by supposing a flash back to the Shema, the confession that Yahweh (the Lord) is One.

The intra-Jewish and inter-Jewish setting highlights instead the distinction between the leaders and the people, a theme that Luke lets dominate the picture of the early days in Jerusalem and beyond (e.g. 4:21). That pattern is familiar to us all in contemporary terms: the Kremlin always thinks the American people are on their side as over against the capitalist and imperialist leaders and establishments. As a matter of fact, it is a pretty timeless apologetic model for struggling revolutionary movements - of which the Jesus movement was one.

Thus we note that Peter here speaks within Judaism, fully identifying with Israel. Such an identification is of great importance for any interpretation. Saebø has reminded us of how Jesus and the apostles inherit the honorable and hard role of the Old Testament prophets. It is important to remember that with that role goes the identification with the people and its lot. But when such prophecies and words of warning and doom spoken within Israel, from and to Jews - when such prophetic words fall into alien hands, then they lose their original meaning even if they were to be quoted verbatim. When Gentile Christians hurled Jesus' words at the Jews something went seriously wrong. But here in Acts 4 the "debate" remains inter-Jewish. There is not a Jewish-Christian tension, but primarily one between the Establishment and the people, the latter being impressed by God's mighty deeds in Jesus' name.

Thesis 5. To the Jewish Establishment, Luke here gives - through Peter's speech - the confession to Jesus Christ, apologetically sharpened by the reference to Psalm 118, used also elsewhere, especially by Luke himself in 20:17 in the parable about the vineyard. It is important to note what I have called an apologetically sharpened confession. Perhaps Saebø is more correct in calling it polemic. (As you well know, there is not too much difference between apologetic and polemic. Most apologetic is written as if it were to be read by the outsiders in defense of us all, but the only ones who buy it are the insiders. That's the way it has always been. The letter of Aristæus is a case in point.) When I lean toward the apologetic, it is because of the setting: Peter speaking when accused before the court. We should note that Peter has the holy spirit especially assisting him in making this speech (4:8), but not so in chapter 3. Those of you who know anything about perjury - and our Norwegian friends have supplied us with a special paper - will know that there is only one situation according to the synoptic gospels and the gospel material in which one can count on the assistance of the holy spirit and that is when one is brought into court, because the martyr, the witness is a witness before the powers, before the authorities. That is why we find that phrase "and Peter, filled with the Holy Spirit..." (4:8). He is in court. (cf. Mt. 10:19-20 par.) And in that situation the defence of the accused is a confession.

Thesis 6. What is, then, the nature, the genre (Gattung) of such a statement as In No Other Name... If it is a confession. What is the nature of such a confession? And now comes the shocking thought - thesis 7: it should be seriously asked if religious language, either confessional, hymnic, or liturgical, that is to say religious language that we call primary religious language, the language of religious experience, should not be considered as love language, as caressing language. That's why Lutherans and Protestants in general have difficulties in understanding what liturgy is about. Liturgy is play, liturgy is repetitious; when you play, when you worship, you use language in a caressing manner. It has the same sort of expression as that kind of language by which one caresses the person dear to one. That is proper since the ultimate aim of our whole existence is to praise God and glorify and enjoy God forever. Liturgy

has a caressing function; its language is a love language. I was struck by the fact that Saebd in point 3.4 of his paper speaks about the "Unvergleichlichkeit Jahwehs," i.e. the way in which Jahweh cannot be compared with anybody else, or when compared, is found to be superior. He could have referred to the literature in which this is done in the most intense form, namely the Song of Songs. Who is like my beloved? There you have it all coming together - in love language.

Or let me make my point differently: If someone were to say that his wife was the only one for him, and he were telling the truth and nothing but the truth, then that would be good. But if he were witnessing in court and was under oath and the judge asked him whether he could be sure that nowhere in the world could there be another woman about whom he could have come to say the same thing, then he could not take such an oath. For in that setting the very same words would take on another meaning. Just as would the words of Peter's confession if treated as an axiom of dogmatic theology.

Now most of you would say that such an interpretation is too subjective. I find, however, subjective/objective distinctions far too blunt an instrument here. The issue is rather that of different languages and intentions, and I think we should seriously ask one another whether the nature of religious language is not rather to be seen in the general direction here outlined.

We would also note then (thesis 8) that such love language is far from innocent or less threatening to the Establishment, as we can judge from this story. (And those of us who were part of the Establishment during the student revolution can witness to the power of the emotionally charged love language which was spoken against us in those days. It was not harmless, not mere words, nor was it "objective" language as everyone might remember. It was a powerful witness, spoken with the power of the powerless.)

Thesis 9. The above theses suggest to me that Acts 4:12 is not a good basis for the absolute claim in an absolute sense, but that it is a natural confession growing out of the faith, growing out of the experience of gratitude. Also out of apostolic humility, i.e. the awareness that they didn't do it themselves but that it was all in the power of the Lord. They thereby pointed away from themselves. Just as any reference to election is saying that one cannot understand how it could happen. Here is a confession, not a proposition. It is a witness, strangely enough not actually an argument, but just exactly a witness. I was asked earlier in our conference what I thought about the call to mission, the commission to mission. As I will take it up in one of the following theses, I have special difficulties with the so-called mission to the Jews, but I certainly have no difficulty with my love to speak about Jesus, and I have no hesitation to do so while together with Jews. Whether I would like to call this mission is another question. A witness is what we have in this passage, a witness which can be easily understood out of the convictions and the experiences.

Thesis 10. All thoughtful believers and believing communities that have taken monotheism seriously must sooner or later reflect upon how their different absolute claims somehow must fit together in God's mysterious plan. In stating this thesis it is clear that I move from the level of primary religious language (prayer, confession, hymn, liturgy) to the level of reflection, afterthought, theology. But let me first - especially as we reflect on Jewish-Christian relations - remind myself and you about a distinct way of understanding monotheism which is very important to many Jews especially today and perhaps should be for us, too. The meaning of monotheism, and the point of the first commandment

are not that there is one God, but really that there is nothing worth calling God but God. It is a radical critique of all claims to divinity, save for God Himself. It is a radical critique of making anything penultimate into something ultimate. This is perhaps in the Jewish tradition the truest way of describing the meaning of monotheism. It is not a question that "one" is better than "many". It is not the rational, the philosophical monotheism. The radical way of saying this is that monotheism is an undercutting of all kinds of divine claims for less than divine things. It is this suspicion against all absolutifying of what is not absolute that explains why Jews have such difficulties with Christians. Not only with our Christologies and our trinitarian affirmations, but with the very shape and style and structure of our theology, i.e. the dogmatic structure in which the penultimate nature of all human language is overshadowed by our urge to absolute assertion - instead of human assertions about that which is absolute.... Such considerations do not minimize the pressing need for considering our thesis 10. But they suggest a theological and religious climate in which that should be done.

When thesis 10 says, "sooner or later" it points to the fact that it would be a little much to expect that such reflection would loom large in the New Testament or in the first exuberant generations of the Jesus movement (thesis 11). The Jews, to be sure, had begun to reflect seriously and deeply on this matter. They were not as particularistic as some Christian textbooks claim. They looked eagerly to the day when God would redeem the whole of his creation, and they saw their witness to the oneness of God and the moral order as their having a role of witness, of being "a light for the nations." God would know how best to use that witness. They had no urge to make other people into Jews, but they were convinced that their witness fit into God's plan for the world.

Perhaps this perspective is best expressed in the most holy prayer of the church - the only prayer to which the church never added the words "through Jesus Christ our Lord" - and the prayer that, as to its actual words, can be fully used by Jews as well as Christians. I refer of course to the Lord's Prayer, and now especially the words "Hallowed be thy Name." Here we look forward to the day when the whole creation will honor and praise God - that is the day when the Kingdom comes. There is no reference to the Judization or Christianization of the world in this language. But the faithful witness of Israel (and the Church) will be used by God toward such a fulfilment of his purposes.

In that context Peter's confessional enthusiasm in Acts 4 is a witness, to be fitted by God into the total scheme of things. But neither in Acts nor in most other strata of the New Testament is there any reflection on how this is to be thought out. As we have said, it would be more than expected if the need for such reflection had made itself felt that early.

Thus it is the more amazing and impressive that such reflection does enter in - and that in the person of Paul (Romans 10-11). But, after all, he was a great and sensitive theologian, who felt and identified the important issues where others muddled through in devoted pragmatism.

Thesis 13. For can it be pure coincidence that in Romans 9-11 the names of Jesus or Christ are not to be found after 10:17 (or even 10:9, depending on what manuscript we read)? And it is equally striking that the doxology by which he concludes this section of Romans (11:33-36) is the only one in Paul which is totally in "God language", i.e. without any reference to Jesus or

Christ. There are not many places in Paul's epistles where you can find three or four pages without reference by name to Jesus or Christ. It so happens that it is in this part of Paul's epistle to the Romans that he consciously (or if unconsciously, then it is the more interesting) drops the Christ language. There is a striking absence of overt Christology. Why? Presumably for the reason that he had found something unnerving in the missionary zeal of his bragging Gentile converts over against the Jewish people. Paul's purpose in Romans 11 is to upbraid Gentile Christians for their haughty attitude toward the Jews. He reminds them that the consummation is a mystery - not we winning over them - "lest you be wise in your own conceits" (11:25). This turn of Pauline thinking stands together with his burning concern for his Jewish brothers and compatriots (9:1-3). So what seems to be present here in Romans 9-11 is Paul's growing awareness that God envisages a co-existence between Jews and Christians, a co-existence that makes mission an inappropriate mode of witness. Paul, the missionary, actually puts brakes on the missionary urge and instinct. He unmasks it as a secularized style of thinking, soiled by hubris on the part of Gentiles. One is reminded of the similar Critique of the party spirit in Corinth, where Paul labels it carnal and immature to treat different doctrines as competing philosophies (1 Cor 3); the spiritual view is the mystery of the church, in which only the eschaton will sort out what is authentic and what is not (cf. 1 Cor 4:5).

It is this profound level of reflection and pastoral sensitivity that must be brought into our thinking. If Paul had second thoughts about the theological and pastoral consequences of statements like the one in Acts 4:12, then we - with a long history of Christian anti-semitism and imperialist mission practices - have the more reason to pursue this Pauline perspective. And there are those amongst us who would think that things have happened since which cannot be absent from or marginal to serious Christian reflection, such as the Holocaust in the 1940's and the establishment of the State of Israel in 1948.

So to put it very simply: as a reader of the Bible one has first and foremost to withstand one's tendency of extending the meaning of every word to a maximum, and start at its most limited and precise meaning and proceed with care. Secondly, one has to begin with serious study of the nature of religious language and the fact that already within the short span of the New Testament a sensitive theologian like Paul had second thoughts about the straight and simply missionary answer to the relations between Jews and Christians.

Translated from German

THE UNITY / UNICITY OF GOD

Jukka Thurén

For Judaism, the unity of God is neither an incidental detail nor a theoretical thesis; it is the very foundation of Jewish life. Samuel S. Cohon sums up the ancient rabbinic principle of faith as follows: " 'Who is a Jew?' they (the rabbis) asked, and replied: 'He who abjures idolatry.' (Meg 13a); also: 'He who denies idolatry is as if he confessed the entire Torah' (Kid 40a). And more positively: 'He is called a Jew, who professes the unity of God.' (Meg 13a)." ¹ Anyone who denies the unity of God, however, denies the basic principle of Judaism, he is kofer b'E-ikkar.²

The exegetical occasion for these considerations quoted from Meg 13a, is Esther 2:5: "Now there was a Jew ... whose name was Mordecai ... a Benjaminite". R. Jochanan said: "(Mordecai) is still a descendant of Benjamin, and why does Scripture call him a Jew? Because he denied idolatry; for everyone who denies idolatry is called a 'Jew', as it is written: 'There are certain Jews' (Dan 3:12)".³ Esther 2:5 answers the same question: "He was called a 'Jew' because he confessed the unity of the divine name before all who come into the world; this means that 'Jew' is equivalent to 'confessor of the one sole God (yehudi yehidi)".⁵

This play on words has its origin in the much older etymological explanation of the name Judah which is already found in Gen 29:35: Yehuda = YHWH, hoda. Because Leah at Judah's birth confessed and praised YHWH, Judah and many of his descendants (for instance David and Daniel) became great in confessing and praising.⁶ It is also said in Gen 49:8 that Judah is praised by his brothers, i.e. according to the exposition of Targum and Midrash on the passage, they all call themselves 'Jews'.⁷ This interpretation of the name 'Judah' then provided the basis of IgEst 2:5 and 3:5; 2:5 means that Mordecai confessed and praised God (mode), while according to 3:5 he was called 'Jew' so that the scripture might be fulfilled that "All nations of the world shall see that the name of YHWH is spoken over you". Consequently the name Yehudi contains the divine name and was perhaps formed from YHWH and hoda; by the very name he bears a Jew proclaims God's glory. On the other hand, anyone who utters the name 'Jew' contemptuously, blasphemes the one God.⁸

Some third century rabbis considered that the evil inclination to idolatry was eradicated from Jewry precisely through Mordecai and the three "Jewish men" (Dan 3).⁹ Hence the motto of the Jews: "Either Jew (confessor) or crucified".¹⁰ Gillerbeck explains: "A Jew will rather be crucified than abandon his faith." The classical martyr's confession of Akiba was in fact the Shema verse with the long-accented ehad. Thus he sought to combine Deut 6:4 with 6:5 (Ber 61b); he loved God "with all his soul" by confessing the unity of God even though God took his soul, his life (Cf. Ber IX 4:5).¹¹ By hoda'a, yihud hashem and sacrifice of life, the commendment of love of God is significantly fulfilled.

In a Jewish-Lutheran dialogue about the unity of God, the Hebrew Bible provides, of course, the common basis. But how are the biblical statements to be interpreted? An Old Testament scholar could introduce a discussion on this with modern Jewish exegesis. A dogmatic theologian could compare, for instance, the Athanasian creed with Maimonides' Thirteen Principles of the Faith, or the Liber Concordiae with the Talmud, or he could deal with later discussions between scholars of the two faiths. I should like to compare Paul with a few of the ancient benedictions of the Synagogue. The texts are more or less contemporary; the benedictions, or at least the mode of thought which forms their basis, were probably familiar to Paul: the introduction to the Shema and the Aleynu prayer.

The Jewish texts belong to the daily synagogue liturgy at the present day, in other words, to the central religious reality of the believing Jew. The Pauline texts are probably read less often by Lutherans. Nevertheless they belong to the 'Canon within the Canon' of the Church.

Since the days of the Second Temple, the Shema has been recited twice daily by the pious Jew. For the interpretation of this declaration of faith, we shall probably best look in the benedictions introductory to the morning Shema: yoser or and ahaba rabba.¹² The first berakha praises God as the creator of the universe, who gives light once again and so renews his creation every day. The second gives thanks for Israel's election.

Ahaba, love, is the first and last word of this benediction.¹³ With abounding love YHWH has chosen his people (ahaba rabba ahabtanu - haboher b'emo Yisrael b'ahaba), so that the nation might confess him in love and proclaim his unity.¹⁴ The recitation of the Shema is thus understood as response to the elective love of the one God. Abudarham (24A) rightly saw in the conclusion of the benediction a combination of Deut 6:4 with 5: Israel demonstrates its love for YHWH by declaring his unity.¹⁵

The recitation of Deut 6:4-9 implies, according to Ber II 2, the taking upon oneself of the yoke of the kingdom of heaven.¹⁶ This is followed by acceptance of the yoke of the commandments (Deut 11:13-21). Consequently Israel prays in Ahaba rabba that God will teach it to learn and fulfil in love all the words of the Torah.

To the unity of God corresponds inner singleness of heart¹⁷ (yahed l' babenu) and the special unity of the confessing congregation (habibenu l' shalom me 'arba kanfot ha'ares). The Shema is therefore not meant to be a theoretical doctrine but the response of a united congregation to the elective love of the one Creator-God.

Precisely as such a response it involves two problems. Yoser or begins with a reference to Isaiah 45:7 "... I form light and create darkness, I make weal and create woe". It has been thought that the statement originally proclaimed the unity of God against Persian dualism. In the Yoser or, however, ra^C has been replaced by hakol; people did not dare to declare that even woe comes from God.¹⁸

Isaiah 45 also declares that one day "every tongue" shall honour YHWH; his enemies shall come to him and be brought to naught or be ashamed (Yaboshu) (45:23f.) while Israel is justified and triumphs. In Ahaba rabba the people of God, "chosen from all nations and tongues" prays that it may never be put to shame (nebosh) but may always be able to rejoice. But here the thought is not that the one God wills to be honoured by all tongues i.e. that the unicity of God demands a universal confession and praise.

This problem is central in the Alenu. It is thought today that this benediction originated in the Temple service.¹⁹ Since Rab it has served as an introduction to the malhuyyot (a series of ten biblical passages which are used to proclaim the sovereignty of YHWH on New Year's Day). Since the 14th century, all synagogue services have concluded with Alenu. In this context, the first part serves as a glance back to the divine service which has just been celebrated. "The Creator and Lord of the world has separated us from the nations and given us a better lot; the nations honour what is not, and pray to a god who cannot help (so reads the unamended text)²⁰ - but we bend the knee and offer worship and thanks before the King of Kings." The profession of faith reads: "He is our God, there is none else; in truth he is our King, there is none besides

him". And the reason: "as it is written in his Law: And thou shalt know this day and lay it to thine heart that YHWH alone is God in heaven above and upon the earth beneath: there is none else." (Dt. 4:39). And so the chosen congregation has once again fulfilled its duty of worshipping the king of the world.

The unity of God here signifies that he alone is king (1) over the whole universe (2) for all eternity. The privileged people of God can experience the presence of this king even now at their worship, and must respond to this by bending the knee, prostration, declaration of faith with praise.

The second part of the Alenu is an eschatological prospect: because the one God is king of the universe, the day must soon come when he will manifest his power so openly that all idols will be destroyed: then all dwellers on the earth will see that to YHWH every knee must bend and every tongue call upon him. Isaiah 45:23 will be fulfilled when the nations take the yoke of the kingdom upon them, i.e. probably, recite the Shema: The prayer ends with a quotation from the Torah and an explanatory prophetic statement: Ex 15:18 "YHWH shall reign for ever and ever"; Zech. 14:9 "And YHWH shall be king over all the earth; in that day shall YHWH be one and his name one". Today the people of the Covenant takes upon itself the yoke of the kingdom of heaven when it celebrates its divine service and especially when it recites the Shema. In the Alenu it prays that all men will soon do so. On that day God's unity will be uncontested.²¹

The two last malshuyot are in fact Zech. 14:9 and Deut. 6:4 - the Shema verse and its eschatological interpretation.²² Of course, YHWH even now is the one and only true God. Nevertheless the prophet promises that YHWH will be one. There is a tension between the unity of God, i.e. his universal kingship, and the only partial confession with praise. Only when every knee bows and every tongue utters the same profession of faith and praise, will YHWH really be one.

"His name" in Zech. 14:9 is probably understood in accordance with deuteronomic theology²³: the Temple in Jerusalem will be the sole centre of the worship of YHWH. In the Alenu, heaven alone is named as the dwelling-place of YHWH; his glorious revelation on earth is awaited, but not localized. At all events "the one name" probably implies united worship in one centre.

Paul appears to know and value the etymological interpretation of the name 'Judah' and 'Jew'. At Rom. 2:17, 28f. he speaks of true Judaism: "But if you call yourself a Jew ..." - "For he is not a real Jew who is one outwardly ... He is a Jew who is one inwardly ... His praise is not from men but from God."²⁴

'Jew' is therefore a title of honour which can only be conferred by God himself, an eschatological epainos. Paul alludes here to an interpretation that was current in the Hellenistic synagogue.²⁵ Philo translates the name 'Judah' as "confession of praise to the Lord"²⁶ (so probably from YHWH hoda). Judah, the fourth son of Leah, is like the fruit that is "holy, and for praise (ainetos)" of the fourth year (Lev. 19:24), for in him the logos or nous proclaims praises (epainos) to God (Sonn I 33ff.). Thus Philo and obviously his source who understood Hebrew, construed the name 'Judah' both in an active and passive sense: Judah confesses and praises the Lord, and for this is recognized and praised not only by his brethren but also by God (Plant 126-136). Philo adds that this divine service is the true logike latreia: Judah devises and sings praises as fruits of a rational (logike) character, and is himself a fruit of that kind (Plant 135).

The Jews are like their ancestor. The sacred vesture of the high priest is an image of the universe (Spec I 95-6), among other reasons because the "high priest of the Jews makes prayers and gives thanks not only on behalf of the whole human

race, but also for the parts of Nature, earth, water, air, fire". Thus the Jewish people, in the high priest, is the cultic representative of the whole creation, the single servant of the one God.

Paul has no objection to such an interpretation of the name 'Jew'. The Jews are indeed chosen to honour God, and conversely, if they are true Jews, they are honoured by God. Where does Paul find the true Jews? To answer this question, we must really bear in mind Romans as a whole; for it can in fact be read as an 'Epistle on the worship of the one God'.

The Gentiles were able to recognize the Creator in his works; nevertheless they did not honour or thank him as God, but worshipped creation instead of Creator. Therefore God gave them up to various kinds of desires. (1:21-25).

The Jews recognize the will of God in the law, and boast of (their) relation to God (=confess him publicly). But because they transgress the law, this boast itself leads to dishonour to God (2:23), as Paul already finds confirmed in Is. 52:5 LXX: "The name of God is blasphemed among the Gentiles because of you."²⁷ Paul feels that here a Jewish thought is turned against the Jews: anyone who defames a Jew, blasphemes the name of God spoken over him; but if a Jew is justly reviled, he himself must bear the blame for the profanation.²⁸

Consequently, both the people and Gentiles alike stand under the wrath of God. And it is here that the Pauline gospel of justification by faith emerges (3:21ff.). The first argument for it is precisely that of God's unity: "For we hold that a man is justified by faith (alone) apart from works of law. Or is God the God of Jews only? Is he not the God of Gentiles also? Yes, of Gentiles also, since God is one; and he will justify the circumcised on the ground of their faith and the uncircumcised through their faith."

Paul assumes that the statement "God is one" is known, is held to be incontrovertible truth and that it must be interpreted in such a way that the self-same God is also the God of the Gentiles. From this he infers that God will justify the Gentiles also. If God were not the God of all peoples, there would be room for other gods.²⁹ But if he did not will to justify the Gentiles, to take them into community with him, he would not really will to be their God.

Paul could be thinking here, for example, of Is. 45:21f., 25: "Was it not I, the Lord? And there is no other god besides me, a righteous God and a Saviour; there is none besides me. Turn to me and be saved, all the ends of the earth! For I am God and there is no other. In the Lord all the offspring of Israel shall be justified (RSV: triumph) and glory." That God is righteous means, of course, that he justifies (Rom. 3:26). If he wills to save all the ends of the earth and so wills to be the God of the Gentiles, the Gentiles too are counted among the offspring of Israel who can glory in God, that is to say, the one God as their God.

But might it not be possible that there could be two ways to righteousness, so that the Jews would have to fulfil their monotheistic profession by the works of the Torah, while the Gentiles as also a congregation of the one God would only have to fulfil the commandments of the covenant with Noah?³⁰

For Paul, faith in one God implies honouring his name and knowing and accomplishing his will. If there were two different communities of worshippers, there would really be two gods. As long as the Jews are to recognize the will of God in the law of Moses, and the Gentiles in another way, it has not yet become clear what God actually wills. If the Torah is a perfect image of God's nature, there cannot be another just as perfect but different.³¹

Until now, God has given over the Gentiles according to Deut. 32:8f. to the gods/angels. Paul demythologizes: God gave them up to impurity, to the lusts of their hearts and all kinds of vices. From Galatians we know that according to Paul even the Jews had no direct relation to the one God; they were entrusted to the law as a paidagogos, the law however was not in fact ordained by the one God, but by a multitude of angels (Gal. 3:20-25).³² In the nature of the One there is no multiplicity; any particularist revelation must eo ipso be imperfect.

According to Romans 4 (precisely as with Gal. 3), God had already given the decisive, single revelation in prototype to Abraham; Gen. 15:5f. shows that the response looked for was faith that gives honour to God (Rom. 4:20). When Abraham was justified, he was not yet 'pious' according to the law, but asebes. His circumcision later did not essentially modify his relation to God. Consequently he serves as prototype of the single people of God consisting of uncircumcised and circumcised. What was important was the promise and faith.

What kind of God was it that Abraham believed in? The God "who gives life to the dead and calls into existence the things that do not exist" (Rom. 4:17) - that is, the Creator who is truly one who still possesses his power. So Abraham became the father of many nations, that is, of the pagans who now believe in him "who raised from the dead Jesus our Lord". The raising of Jesus and his position as "our Lord", therefore confirm the unity of God and make possible that united worship among the peoples of the whole world which is in accord with his nature. The preaching of the gospel brings about this worship.

In Rom. 10:11-13 the unity of the Lord (Jesus) is used as an argument. The composition is symmetrical:

'No one who believes in him will be put to shame.'³³

Therefore there is no distinction between Jew and Greek;
for one and the same is Lord of all and bestows his riches upon all
who call upon him.

For everyone who calls upon the name of the Lord will be saved.³⁴

The scriptural quotations substantiate the inner and outer sides of the relation to God (faith, invocation). Between them, the oneness of the way of salvation is proved by Jesus' position as Kyrios Pantokrator.³⁵ Now the response to revelation expected by God is wholly one. Paul finds the two-sided response also indicated in Deut. 30:14, where in the original text the great commandment of love of God (Deut. 6:5) is dealt with paraenetically: "The word is very near you, in your mouth and in your heart ...". The word [of the gospel!] is in the heart as faith, in the mouth as invocation, confession, acclamation: "Kyrios Jesus!" Both belong together, for faith, as chapter 4 has already said, is faith in the God who raised Jesus from the dead and so made him our Lord. Consequently God is honoured now when Jesus is acknowledged and invoked as Lord.

Many pagans have already done this. Israel first of all in the main has failed, and so fulfilled Is. 65:2 "I spread out my hands all the day to a rebellious people ... following their own devices"; where the contrasting pisteuein and apeithein, homologeîn and antilegeîn are not without significance. For it is, of course, important for Paul that heart and mouth of the people of God should be in accord.

The transition from the 'doctrinal' to 'paraenetical' part of Romans is no less interesting. The discussions culminate in a doxology framed on the Stoic-pantheistic pattern: "For from him and through him and to him are all things. To

him be glory for ever. Amen." (11:36). The paraenesis begins with a comprehensive admonition to present their bodies as a living, holy, acceptable sacrifice and so celebrate the logike letreia. What, according to Philo, is performed representatively by Judah/the Jews, is now expected of the Christians: they alone can acceptably serve the one Creator-God; they are the true Jews. Here the body is named as sacrifices; the conclusion of the paraenesis stresses the verbal side of divine service (15:6):³⁶ "... that together you may with one voice glorify the God and Father of our Lord Jesus Christ". Just as Christ has welcomed all, so the groups in the congregation must welcome one another "for the glory of God" (15:7), for "I tell you that

Christ became a servant to the circumcised to show God's truthfulness
- in order to confirm the promises given to the patriarchs
- and in order that the Gentiles might glorify God for his mercy."
The doctrinal statement is justified and explained by quotations. How, then, does Christ bring about the united praise of God?

First of all, Psalm 18:49/2 Sam. 22:50 are quoted: "Therefore I will praise thee among the Gentiles, and sing to thy name". Who is praising whom? Paul his Lord? According to the original text, the psalm is "A Psalm of David, the servant of the Lord/YHWH", after YHWH had delivered him from the hand of his enemies. And since the last quotation (Rom. 15:12/Is. 11:1,10) designates Jesus as the root of Jesse and the ruler of the Gentiles, it is most natural to find in the first quotation Isaiah's new shoot of Jesse, the eschatological confessor of Judah's line, who gives thanks for his deliverance and in the next two quotations calls the nations together with the ancient people of God into his community of praise. Through his death and resurrection Jesus has welcomed and become the Lord of all - but at the same time he has remained the servant of his "God and Father", and inaugurates the united divine worship. Paul believes that first the Gentiles but then also the People will follow his invitation. The Jews will furthermore praise God more for his fidelity, the heathen for his mercy, but this difference does not disturb the united worship.

In 1 Cor. 8:1,4 Paul quotes with apparent agreement at first, two of his correspondents' catch-phrases: "... we know that 'all of us possess knowledge'; "... we know that 'an idol has no real existence', and that 'there is no God but one'".

It is no chance that the Corinthians' knowledge is formulated negatively; the emphasis is on the non-existence of the idols; faith in the one God is, as it were, an exception to the basic atheistic rule. For the Corinthians, this thesis means freedom to eat food offered to idols, perhaps even to take part in sacrificial meals.

Paul sees deeper here; this negative knowledge "puffs up" the ego and separates a man from his brethren. As long as monotheistic knowledge remains a metaphysical, ideological thesis, it inevitably emphasizes what is negative, because a philosophically acquired knowledge does not constitute a real relation to the one God.

Paul's relation to the Corinthian's thesis appears at first sight to be incoherent. In v.7 he withdraws the agreement expressed in v.1: "However, not all possess this knowledge". Some, even as Christians, are so accustomed to the idols, that their conscience cannot draw conclusions from the non-existence of the gods. Paul does not seek to enlighten their conscience in this respect. His argument must be valid "even if so-called gods exist" - in fact, he even

concedes that there are many such gods and lords (v.5). They may "exist in heaven or on earth", says Paul, and even consciously accepts apparent contradiction of Deut. 4:39, which is of course quoted in the Alenu: "Thus you shall know ... that the Lord alone is God in heaven above and on the earth beneath; there is no other." In regard to theoretical monotheism, Paul is less progressive and enlightened than his correspondents.³⁷ He even has to come close to heresy in order to show what belief in one God really means.

Paul introduces his answer with a critique of the Corinthian concept of knowledge: "If any one imagines that he knows something, he does not yet know as he ought to know" (v.2). It is not sufficient to know "something", e.g. a monotheistic thesis; the only important knowledge of God implies love of God. It is not attained by human enlightenment, but by divine election: "But if one loves God, one is known by him" (v.3).³⁸ Here Paul is probably not thinking in Old Testament terms only in a general way, but is referring in particular to the Shema. There in fact the knowledge that "YHWH our God, YHWH is one", is both the consequence of God's elective/known love and the expression of responding love.

Love of God is really only an unfolding of the profession of faith in "our God". So Paul can equate love with the declaration of faith: "for us there is (only) one God, the Father, from whom are all things and for whom we exist", which is, of course, a personal and ecclesiological variant of Rom. 11:36 ("... from him ... and to him are all things"); Paul has now added hemin and replaced ta panta by hemeis. Conzelmann comments³⁹: "Here too, Paul makes it clear that it is not a question of metaphysical or ontological judgments but of anthropological ones which go ipso include the adoption of an attitude: The gods become gods by being believed in." The Pauline profession of faith, however, is even more an ecclesiological judgment: false even though monotheistic knowledge creates puffed-up individuals, whereas true profession of faith constitutes a congregation which says 'we'. That is why Paul can begin: "Love builds up" (the congregation) - not just love the neighbour, but actual love for the one God, to whom there corresponds one congregation united by love.

In the clause "as indeed there are many gods and many lords", the two phrases are probably chosen with a view to Christian profession of faith.⁴⁰ For this time the middle phrase of Rom. 11:36 is replaced by a declaration of faith in Christ: "and one Lord, Jesus Christ, through whom are all things and through whom we exist". Paul therefore is aware of a mediator-of-creation Christology (Christ as logos, wisdom, eikon of God),⁴¹ but here he is emphasizing that the congregation has been built up by the one same mediator. But the congregation is built up by love (v.1) - it must therefore have been founded in a similar way. In v.10 this is stated. False knowledge (which according to v.1 does not build up but "puffs up") can also 'build' something: the brother is "encouraged ('built up') to eat food offered to idols" and consequently destroyed, "the brother for whom Christ died" (v.11). By his death Christ has shown God's love, and consequently built up the congregation - the Christian congregation thinks of Jesus' death when it prays ahaba rabba shabtanu:

Consider for example Rom 5:8: "God shows his love for us in that Christ died for us" and Gal. 2:20: "by faith in the Son of God who loved me and gave himself for me". In this way God's elective love has constituted the congregation which can pronounce the true monotheistic profession of faith. A monotheistic knowledge which is determined by a theoretical negation and not by Jesus' death, is not only valueless, but can even build up the congregation of idols.

When Paul reverts to the same theme in 1 Cor. 10, it becomes clear what the

so-called 'gods and lords' are: behind them are demons, the existence of which is not disputed by Paul at all (10:20). Paul here echoes Deut. 32:17,21: In the desert Israel sacrificed to demons which are not God, and so provoked the Lord by what is no god. Paul asks (10:22): "Shall we provoke the Lord to jealousy? Are we stronger than he?" The alleged monotheists are in danger of becoming servants of demons. Their gnosis does indeed puff up, but can these proud people stand the test before the Lord?

Paul therefore establishes once again that the knowledge of God constitutes a congregation. False gnosis can even lead to fellowship with demons, true knowledge to communion with God, which is celebrated in the Lord's Supper; that communion is brought about because Christ died for us out of love and invites us to his sacrificial meal.

We have seen how similarly Paul and the synagogue at prayer understand God's unicity.

1. The unity of God is not a philosophical knowledge, but belongs to the confession of praise which the congregation lovingly expresses in response to God's elective love.
2. Because God is one, he wills to be known by one congregation united in singleness of heart.
3. The one God is Creator of the whole world. Consequently he wills to be and is known by all creation. The present-day chosen congregation is precursor of the future world-wide congregation which will include all nations.
4. The confession of praise implies obedience to the revelation of God's will; what God is, comes to light in the revelation of his will.
5. The unity of God also means that he remains ever the same. He, who created the world and life from nothing, can do so again.

Paul, however, also draws consequences which were not drawn in the synagogue prayers which we have referred to.

1. The Shema is a loving response to God's love. But whom has God loved? Paul refers to Mal. 1:2f.: God loved Jacob, but not Esau (Rom. 9:13). Side by side with this, however, he sets Hos. 2:23 (Rom. 9:25): "Those who were not my people I will call 'my people', and her who was not beloved I will call 'my beloved'." God's love is now known in the death of Jesus, whom God did not spare but gave up for us (8:32).⁴² For us? Yes, for ungodly, enemies, sinners, for the many, for all (5:6,8,12-21). The one God has bestowed his love on all men in the death of the one man Jesus Christ.

2. Now at last, therefore, a united congregation can come into existence. Faith is now the response of the heart, which God expects from all men and which he accounts as justice: in this way Abraham becomes the father of many nations which nevertheless are one seed.

3. Paul knows that the Jews, too, in the sense of (Deutero-) Isaiah hope for the conversion of the Gentiles and even try to bring it about. (Rom. 2:19f.). He affirms, however, that only Jesus after his resurrection can fulfil the function of the true Jew. (15:9). The apostle and the Christians are his means.

4. Paul often speaks of the obedience which is now expected from all peoples (e.g. Rom. 1:5; 5:19). Christians are no longer given up to the law or their

lusts, but "have become obedient ... to the standard of teaching to which you were committed"⁴³ (6:17). It is not said what this teaching comprises; at all events it must be the one single revelation mediated by the Lord Jesus in accord with the nature of the one God.

5. The Jewish benedictions to which we have referred, do not deduce from God's creative power belief in the resurrection; that is merely by chance, as e.g. Elohay neshama and the second berakha of the Amida show: Because the one God remains the same, he can always save and will revive even the dead; in this he shows his fidelity: ne' eman attā l' hahayot metim. According to Paul, God has confirmed his fidelity by the fact that he has already raised Jesus.⁴⁴ Anyone now who trusts to the faithful God, thinks as he does so of Jesus' resurrection.

Paul intends to be a consistent monotheist. Belief in the one God does not need to be treated thematically (cf. however 1 Thess. 1:9) or proved, but it must be clarified and deepened. According to Paul, that belief in the full sense has only now become possible, now that God has shown his love for all men, now that Jews and Greeks can confess God's unity in one congregation, in obedience to the one revelation by the one Lord Jesus. Jesus' resurrection has confirmed God's unity inasmuch as God is indeed the same Creator who to this day makes living what was dead.

A Jewish reader of the Pauline letters can regard not a few Pauline theses as conceivable. If Jesus and his apostles were really able to convert the Gentiles to faith in the one living God, they truly served the divine plans. As long as Paul in the texts quoted, speaks of the "man" or "servant" Jesus, or of the "God and Father", he is speaking in pure Jewish terms.

Joel 3:5 is quoted in Jewish texts, however, as a proof that one may not invoke any mediator, not even an angel, but only the one God.⁴⁵ How can Paul here calmly let the same passage be applied to the Lord Jesus? In Is. 45:23, the Hebrew synagogue had already interpreted "sworn" as 'confess',⁴⁶ but the confession is made to YHWH (cf. Rom. 14:10-12). How can Paul in Philippians 2 quote a hymn in which the fulfilment of this prophecy (ardently awaited by the synagogue also) takes place to the risen Jesus (cf. also Rom. 14:9)? Is it possible that Paul, who of course is so zealous to draw out all the implications of monotheistic faith, did not see that belief in the one God is imperilled?⁴⁷ The question is not only if and how Paul can defend his confession of Christ, but why he does not attempt to do so:

If we interpret Paul's hypothesis as a natural prerequisite of all Christological considerations rather than as an incidental breakthrough from Old Testament monotheism⁴⁸ and the apocalyptic intermediate Kingdom doctrine, then perhaps the answer is to be found in 1 Cor. 15:24-28: "...then (comes) the end, when he delivers the Kingdom to God the Father after destroying every rule and every authority and power. For he must reign 'until God has put all his enemies under his feet'. The last enemy to be destroyed is death. For 'God has put all things in subjection under his feet'. But when it says, 'all things are put in subjection under him', it is plain that he is excepted who put all things under him. When all things are subjected to him, then the Son himself will also be subject to him who put all things under him, that God may be everything to everyone."

For Paul, as for the Alenu prayer, the unity of God implies the eternal, universal kingship of God. In the Alenu, the goal of world history is the ending of the world in the Kingdom of God (l'e takken 'olam b'emalkut saddal). According to

Paul, telos (end, goal) is achieved when Christ delivers to his⁴⁹ God and Father the Kingdom which was entrusted to him. In the intervening period, the Kingdom must prevail throughout the entire universe.

Ps. 110:1 and Ps. 8:7 help us to interpret the present phase.

Ps. 110 acknowledges two "Lords", Kyrios/YHWH and "My Lord" who sits as King at the right hand of YHWH. YHWH will make all the King's enemies a footstool for the king, a process that naturally does not exclude but rather presupposes action by the King himself. The process is now going on. Jesus has been enthroned and may therefore be confessed as and called "my/our Lord". This very summons to the whole of creation to give obedience to the Kyrios Jesus, is God's way of bringing about his Kingdom: stubborn enemies will be destroyed. Confession of the "Kyrios Jesus" is not at all incompatible with the Kyriotes of God. On the contrary, by this confession, the Kyrios Jesus takes upon himself the yoke of God's Kingdom.

We saw above that God proved his love through the love and devotion of Jesus. In exactly the same way, he now reveals his kingship in the kingship of Jesus by putting everything under the feet of Jesus, by having Jesus put everything under his feet. Paul, however, stressed the conjunction "until". Once the Kingdom of Jesus is undisputed, it has fulfilled its task: Everything has achieved its telos.

The one God is the creator. The next step is the linking of the lordship of Jesus with the creation of (Jesus) the man. Who is this man to whom, according to Ps.8 and Gen. 1-2, all things have been made subject? Was it not Adam, with his descendants? In 1 Cor. 15:22, Paul rejects this interpretation. After all, it was through Adam that death triumphed. Not until the raising of Christ and of those who accept him is victory over death achieved. Once death, the previous sovereign, has been destroyed, the original intention of the Creator is fulfilled: man has made all things subject to him.

Christ and the Christians are, of course, already the servants of God the Father, but Christ must possess some degree of sovereignty so long as there are still enemies. Why is the dominion of Christ dependent on the existence of hostile powers?

I should like to look for the explanation in an aspect of the old Hebrew royal ritual: God raises up kings "from the dust to kingship"⁵⁰, in order to underline the source of all human power. Nebuchadnezzar was humbled and raised up, "to the end that the living may know that the Most High rules the kingdom of men and gives it to whom he will, and sets over it the lowliest of men" (or can set). Dan. 4:17. Adam was, as we know, raised from the death to become a ruler; according to Dan. 12:1-3, the wise shall be awakened from the dust to heavenly glory.

For Paul, the subjection of the angels is especially important. Perhaps he was familiar with an old apocalyptic notion, whereby the required proskynese before⁵¹ man was the decisive test of subjection that Satan and his angels did not pass. It is in 1 Cor. that the subjection of all earthly and heavenly majesty is made a central theme: by acknowledging the weak and crucified Jesus, whom God raised from the dead, we are honoring God. The human, and above all the demonic rulers of the world did not acknowledge - were not permitted to acknowledge - the Divine majesty of Jesus, because God had decreed that this majesty should be revealed in abasement. God chose this form of revelation in order to sweep away all visible

majesty, "so that no human being might boast in the presence of God" - and, of course, no angel either. For Paul the raising of the crucified Christ was not a disturbing element in monotheism, but the only way to the pure and proven praise of God.

Thus, every knee should bow before the crucified Man "in heaven and on earth and under the earth, and every tongue confess that Jesus Christ is Lord, to the glory of God the Father (Phil. 2,10). In this way, and in this way only, God intends to stamp out polytheism. Once this homage has been paid by every creature, Jesus will have fulfilled his task: then he will have subjected all things. He will certainly reign for ever with those who believe in him (e.g. Rom. 5:17), but the glory of God is no longer concealed behind the abasement of the crucified Christ. The Son's dominion will have achieved its goal, its telos, when the covert epiphany has been replaced by the overt theophany.

This outline might give the impression that Jesus is no more than a creature whom God chose as a vehicle for demonstrating his own glory. But according to Paul, Jesus must be a second or "last" Adam: the descendant of the first Adam inherited, without exception, the sins and death of Adam, and so Jesus must be the first-born of a new creation; otherwise, he could not have shown obedience. Such Christology is not inconceivable in the context of Judaism: the Qumran texts and other apocalyptic writings all know something of the need for a rebirth as a prerequisite of the eschatological Kingdom of the chosen.

If the term "Son of God" expressed no more than the new relationship of Jesus to God, then Rom. 8:32, for example, would of necessity lose its paradoxical quality: "He who did not spare his own Son..." And precisely this incomparable love revealed the unity of God to Paul, logically and finally. As an example of obedience, the death of Jesus was an act of the Man, but as reconciliation and redemption it was the act of God, who was himself in Jesus. Paul can save the straightforward simplicity of his theology by the dichotomy of his Christology.

For Judaism too it is also very important that the Shema is an answer to a direct experience of Divine love. The theme of the Geulla benediction is handled exhaustively in the Passa-Haggadah. The deuteronomic "We" is stressed: God delivered not only our fathers from Egypt but us, too. And he did it himself (Ex. 12:12): "not through an angel, not through a seraph, not through a messenger, but the Lord Himself in his glory (bikbodo ub^{ec} asmo)..." then comes the reiterated emphasis: "I, and not an angel, I and not a seraph, I and not a messenger, I, YHWH, ani hu lo aher". That is why there can be no other gods for "us": in the fundamental revelation of love, God himself acted, without any intermediary.

The exodus as such was only the basis of Jewish monolatry. For Paul the exodus of all men, because of steadfast monotheism, happened in the death and resurrection of Jesus. As redeemed, exalted and already obedient human being, Jesus represents the new mankind: not Jesus but we too are redeemed. But in him God Himself, b^{ec} asmo, loved and saved us.

We can also think of the Aqeda: if Abraham had not sacrificed his own son and therefore himself, his action would not have had the same basic significance - after all, Abraham had often before offered up animal sacrifices. In the death of Jesus, God gave the supreme proof of his love, because Jesus was not only a created human being but also God's one and only Son and so in a way he was God himself.

* * * *

Translator's note: For the text of the Alenu and other prayers, The Authorized Daily Prayer Book, Hebrew and English, London, 2nd ed. 1962, has been consulted. Scriptural quotations are from the Revised Standard Version.

Sources and Annotations

1. Samuel S. Cohon, Jewish Theology. A historical and systematic interpretation of Judaism and its Foundations, Assen 1971, S.99. - Zur "dogmatischen" Bedeutung von hoda und kafar vgl. M. Kadushin, The Rabbinic Mind, New York 1952, 340ff.
2. M. Jastrow. Dictionary I, 661: "to deny the principle of religion (unity of God etc)".
3. Vgl. Billerbeck III 96f.
4. Est 3:2ff: er hat vor Haman nicht die Knie gebeugt und sich niedergeworfen.
5. Billerbeck III 96; Jastrow I 574.
6. GenR 71; J. Thurén, Das Lobopfer der Hebräer, Åbo 1973, 126f.
7. TgPsJon z.St., GenR 98.
8. A. Meyer glaubt, dass Jak 2:7 ("Lästern nicht /die Reichen/ den schönen Namen, der über euch ausgesprochen worden ist") ursprünglich den JHWH-Namen meint, der im Namen Jehuda/Jehudi enthalten ist: "Wer also den Judennamen schmäht, schmäht den Herrn der Herrlichkeit JHWH HWD=Kyrinos tes doxes/. auf den dieser Name hinweist. Dann haben wir hier eine Reaktion des Judaeus Apella und all der curti Judaei gegen die vielen grossen und kleinen Bosheiten, die sie wider ihren Namen zu hören bekamen"; A. Meyer, Das Rätsel des Jacobusbriefes, Giessen 1930, 249f. Meyer hätte seine Annahme wenigstens mit TgEst 9:5 stützen können: Bei Meyer ist übrigens auch das von F. Wutz gesammelte Material zur Deutung des Juda-Namens benutzt, op.cit. 202,209,212ff,227f,238,248f.)
9. Billerbeck III 111f.
10. ExR 42. Billerbeck III 96f.

11. Zugleich wird dadurch nach Ber IX:5 eine andere Schwierigkeit überwunden: Man soll Gott bekennen (hoda; nicht "danken", wie oft übersetzt wird), auch wenn er Böses gibt: auch das Leiden des Unschuldigen kommt von demselben Gott. Aqiba hat das geleistet; sein Zeitgenosse, Elia b. Abuja hat einmal das Martyrium eines Rabbinerschülers gesehen und ist Dualist geworden (so nach Jer Hag 2:1, vgl. S.S. Cohon, The Unity of God, HUCA 26, 1955, 450f).
12. Unten wird auch die abschliessende Beraka, Geulla, beachtet.
13. Hervorgehoben von J.H. Hertz, Authorized Daily Prayer Book, New York, 1971, 116.
14. Die Infinitive jehodot ¹⁸ka ul'jahädka fehlen in Amr M und S (Seder R. Amran Gaon I, ed. D. Hedegård, Lund, 1951, Kap 20) und dürften somit ein späterer Einschub sein. Die Denkweise ist jedoch alt.
15. Hedegård op.cit.52
16. Auch in der Liturgie selbst wird der Schma-Vers eng mit dem Königtum Gottes verknüpft, z.B. durch die Responsion baruk sem kehod malkuto ... und durch die den Schma-Teil abschliessende Benediktion Geulla, wo das heutige Schma-Lesen mit Ex 15:18 gleichgesetzt wird: die Exodus-Generation hat so das Königtum Gottes anerkannt, die aktuelle Gemeinde durch die Rezitation von Schma.
17. Hertz op.cit. 118 kommentiert: "Make them single-hearted and undivided in our allegiance; make it our heart's sole purpose to love and reverence Thy Name". Vielleicht könnte man jedoch auch an die lobpreisende Gemeinde als jehad denken; vgl. das paulinische homothymadon etc.
18. Ber 11ab, Gem zu Ber I:4: "ein beschönigender Ausdruck". Nach Ber IX:5 soll man trotzdem auch das Böse als etwas von Gott Kommendes bekennen, vgl. Anm. 11 oben.
19. Enc. Judaica I 557, Hertz 208.
20. Enc. Judaica ebd. warik und Jesü haben denselben Zahlenwert, ebenso lahäbäl warik mit Jesü uMuhammad!
21. Die Zeitbestimmungen hajom und bajom hahu sind bei der Wahl der Zitate gewiss beachtet worden.
22. Die zehn Malkijot bestehen aus je drei Zitaten aus Tora, Psalmen und Propheten; Dt 6:4 ist der abschliessende Höhepunkt der Reihe.
23. Elliger ATD 25 (1950) zu Zach 14:9.
24. Zur etymologischen Deutung des Namens "Jude" in Rm 2:29 s. z.B. die Kommentare von Sanday-Headlam, Moe, Michel, Berrett. Diese Deutung ist jedoch nicht so jung, wie Sanday-Headlam u.a. glauben (Dr. Gifford 1889!). Schon J.A. Eengel schreibt im Gnomon: "Alludit ad nomen Judaeus. joduka laudabunt te Gen. 49,8. --- Resolv. Judaeus, qui in occulte est, est ille Judaeus, qui laudem habet, q.d. vera Judaitas." Schon Origenes sagt in seinem Joh-Kommentar, dass die wahren Juden ihren Namen von dem Hohenpriester Juda/Jesus (Hbr 4:14, 7:14?) bekommen haben und dass sie ihn loben (Gen 49:8) und so seine Brüder sind. Auch Petrus und Paulus waren früher nur äusserlich Juden gewesen, jetzt bekennen (homologantes) sie ihr Judentum mit Worten und bezeugen es durch ihre Taten. Schon Origenes hat also Rm 2 mit Hilfe von Gen 49 gedeutet.
25. E. Käsemann, HNT z.Rm 2:29 (S.72): "Sollte Pls das wirklich im Sinne haben, dürfte es der römischen Gemeinde kaum verständlich geworden sein". Die Geläufigkeit der Deutung bei Philon und in den Onomastiken macht das

Gegenteil wahrscheinlich.

26. Kyrio exomologesis, Plant 134, Exomologesis wird weiter durch ainesis, epainos, eucharistie usw. erklärt; vgl. Thurèn, Lobopfer, S.110-113.
27. Die rabbinischen Texte zitieren oft Ez 36:20 im selben Sinne (Billerbeck III 118). Z.B. Jona 86a (Billerbeck I 415): Abaje hat gesagt: "Du sollst JHWH, deinen Gott, lieben (Dt. 6:5), damit der Name Gottes um deinetwillen geliebt werde. --- Wenn einer die Schrift und die Mischna studiert und den GelehrtenSchülern dient und sein Handel und Wandel vollzieht sich nicht in Redlichkeit --- Über ihn sagt die Schrift: Als sie nun unter die Völker kamen, ... entweihten sie meinen heiligen Namen, indem man von ihnen sagte: Diese sind das Volk JHWHs, und aus seinem Lande haben sie ausziehen müssen."
28. Die Kritik des Paulus ist ein Stück jüdischer Selbstkritik, vgl. Anm. 27.
29. Käsemann, Rm 96.
30. Vgl. M. Wyschogrod, The Law: Jews and Gentiles, in: Speaking of God Today, ed. P.D. Opsehl, M.H. Tanenbaum, Philadelphia 1973, p.13.
31. A. Nissen (Gott und der Nächste im antiken Judentum, Tübingen 1974) zeigt, dass a) die Offenbarung der Abdruck Gottes selbst ist, b) die Willenskundgabe die Mitte der Offenbarung ist, c) der Gotteswille in der Gestalt einer vollkommenen Summe erfüllbarer Gebote in der Tora gegeben worden ist. (Zusammenfassend S. 415f.).
32. F. Mussner (Herder) z.St.
33. Jes 28:16, nach dem vollständigen Zitat Rm 9:32f: der Stein des Anstosses=Christus.
34. Joel 3:5
35. Vgl. Käsemann, Rm 279.
36. Z.Folg. vgl. Thurèn, Hedningarnas offerliturgi, Helsinki 1970, 22-31.
37. H. Conzelmann, 1Korinther (Meyer), 169.
38. Conzelmann, 1Kor 168.
39. Conzelmann, 1Kor 172.
40. Vgl. auch Dt. 4:39, wo "Herr" Subjekt, "Gott" Prädikat ist. Paulus unterscheidet nicht zwischen zwei Gruppen von göttlichen Wesen.
41. Conzelmann, 1Kor 172.
42. Abraham hat seine Gottesfurcht darin erwiesen, dass er seinen einzigen/ geliebten Sohn nicht verschont hat (Gen 22:12,16): er hat Gott mehr geliebt als seinen einzigen Sohn. Nach der jüdischen Auslegung hat Isaak freiwillig die Aqeda vollziehen lassen: auch er hat mehr Gott als sich selbst geliebt. Auch Abraham hat in seinem geliebten Sohn eigentlich sich selbst geopfert. - In dem Abschnitt le'olam le'he adam jere samajim wird das Privileg Israels, Schma rezitieren zu dürfen, mit Aqeda und mit Gottes Liebe zu Jakob erklärt: "Darum ist es unsere Pflicht, dich zu bekennen ..." Der Abschnitt erinnert an

Ahaba rabba und Alenu, will aber die Wurzel der sonst unerklärlichen Liebe Gottes in der Liebenswürdigkeit der Patriarchen finden. Paulus beginnt nicht mit Gen 22 sondern mit Gen 15: Gott rechtfertigt den Unfrommen; das Opfer des geliebten Sohnes ist in der Tat der archimedische Punkt des Gottesverhältnisses, aber nicht Abraham sondern Gott selbst hat so seine Liebe erwiesen. Darum hat wirklich jeder Mensch dasselbe Privileg erhalten.

43. Paredothete 6:17 erinnert an paredoken in 1:24,26,28: die Heiden waren den Lasten übergeben (die Juden dem Gesetz), die Christen sind einem völlig abweichenden Typus des Unterrichts übergeben worden.
44. Die zweite Beraka des 18-Gebets; Rm 15:8: Jesus hat die Treue Gottes durch seine Auferstehung bestätigt: jetzt sieht man, dass Gott wirklich nāman l'ehahajot metim ist.
45. JerBer 9,1 (13a); Billerbeck II 616, Cohon, Unity 474f.
46. Z.B. im Alenu-Gebet; vgl. auch das vielleicht aus dem 2.Jh stammende Gebet Nismat kol haj, wo Jes 45:23 durch "bekennen" erweitert wird: ki kol pā l'eka jodā w'ekol lason l'eka tisba c w'ekol bārāk l'eka tikra c. Die Lesart exomologesetai pro omeitai in Jes 45:23 LXX hat ihre Wurzeln bereits in der liturgischen Tradition der hebräischen Synagoge.
47. W.Bousset, Kyrios Christos 1913,180-186, findet in der paulinischen Christologie "eine merkwürdige Komplizierung und Belastung derjenigen Einfachheit und Schlichtheit der Religion, die auf den Höhepunkten der alttestamentlichen Religion und im Evangelium Jesu zur Erscheinung kommt. Denn das Objekt des religiösen Glaubens wie der gottesdienstlichen Verehrung stellt sich nunmehr in einer eigentümlichen durchgängigen Verdoppelung". P a u l u s habe freilich die beiden Grössen noch durchweg auseinanderzuhalten versucht, der massive Gemeindeglaube sei jedoch "über diese mühsamen Unterschiede" glatt hinweggegangen und habe die Gottheit Christi bewusst ausgesprochen. - Die Frage ist, warum Paulus diese Fehldeutung nicht entdeckt und bekämpft hat, obwohl er z.B. die Gefahr der krass präsentischen Eschatologie und der Freiheitsverkündigung so klar gesehen hat. Kann er im Zentrum des jüdischen Glaubens blind gewesen sein?
48. Vgl. Bousset, Schriften des NT, 1917, z.1Kor 15:28: "Siegreich und gross steigt der reine Monotheismus empor: 'Damit Gott Alles in Allem sei'".
49. Vgl. diejenigen Stellen, die vom Lobpreis vor dem Gott und Vater Jesu Christi sprechen, z.B. Rm 15:16: schon jetzt gibt Jesus die Ehre seinem Gott und Vater; im Kultus wird der Endzustand vorausgegriffen.
50. Vgl. W. Brueggemann, From Dust to Kingship, ZAW 84 (1972) 1-18.
51. Bousset und Gressman (Die Religion des Judentums, 408) meinen, dass diese Spekulation zwar "unjüdisch", aber bereits in SapSal vorausgesetzt sei.
52. Von den Fragen, auf welche ich nicht habe eingehen können, möchte ich jedoch eine nennen. Im Talmud wird vom jüdischen Erzhäretiker Aher (Eliša b.Abuja) erzählt, dass er u.a. aufgrund seiner mystischen Erlebnisse und wegen des Leidens der Unschuldigen seinen monotheistischen Glauben verloren hat: er hat Metatron im Thronsaal Gottes sitzen gesehen und das Martyrium eines Schülers nicht ertragen können. Wagt man daraus zu schliessen, dass die mystischen Himmelspekulationen und der (gnostische?) Dualismus zwischen einem guten und einem bösen Grundprinzipium für das antike Judentum eine grosse Versuchung waren, die in der Kirche durch die Konzentration auf Christus (Kolossierbrief) und auf sein unschuldiges Leiden überwunden wurden? Was hat die Bekämpfung dieser Gefahren für die Synagoge bedeutet?

PARTICIPANTS

Rev. Arnulf Baumann
Hannover, Federal Republic
of Germany

Prof. Robert W. Bertram
Saint Louis, Missouri, USA

Dr. Erwin Buck
Saskatoon, Canada

Prof. Christoph Burchard
Heidelberg, Federal Republic
of Germany

Rev. A. Burghoorn
Apeldoorn, Netherlands

Rev. Blaise Chavannes
Colmar, France

Rev. Juan Cobrda
Buenos Aires, Argentina

Rev. Eberhard von Dessien
Lübeck, Federal Republic
of Germany

Prof. Harold H. Ditmanson
Northfield, Minnesota, USA

Rev. Reinhard Dobbert
Nürnberg, Federal Republic
of Germany

Rev. Leif Flårenes
Oslo, Norway

Prof. George Forell
Iowa City, Iowa, USA

Rev. Anker Gjerding
Dyssekilde, Denmark

Prof. Yoshio Ishida
Tokyo, Japan

Mrs. Trudy Jensen
Minneapolis, Minnesota, USA

Dr. Bo Johnson
Lund, Sweden

Rev. Christian Krause
Hannover, Federal Republic
of Germany

Mr. Løif Michelsen
Tertnes, Norway

Mr. Heikki Nurminen
Helsinki, Finland

Dr. Paul Opsahl, Chairman
New York, New York, USA

Dean Magne Saebø
Oslo, Norway

Dr. Arne Sovik, Secretary
Geneva, Switzerland

Mr. Peter Steensgaard
Lystrup, Denmark

Dean Krister Stendahl
Cambridge, Massachusetts, USA

Rev. Laszlo Terray
Oslo, Norway

Dr. Jukka Thurén
Turku, Finland

Rev. Axel Torm
Virum, Denmark

Dr. Ludwig Wächter
Berlin-Pankow, German
Democratic Republic

Dr. John Wilch
Leichendorf, Federal Republic
of Germany

JEWS IN THE NORTH

by Oskar Mendelsohn

Denmark

Denmark was the first of the Scandinavian countries in which Jews were permitted to settle. The first arrivals date from 1622, when King Christian IV invited members of the Sephardic communities in Amsterdam and Hamburg to settle in Glückstadt in the duchy of Holstein (belonging to the Danish king) with religious liberty and commercial privileges. A few accepted the invitation. Other Sephardic Jews were also active in Denmark as financiers and jewelers to the royal family and Danish nobility. Others, such as the Texeira family, were engaged in financial operations in Denmark and in mining in Norway during the 17th and 18th centuries. There was a Jewish community existing also in Schleswig-Holstein (Altona). German Jews wishing to settle in the kingdom of Denmark first had to procure royal permission which was granted only to applicants with sufficient capital to establish industrial enterprises. Later, rabbis and teachers were permitted to practice when guaranteed by leaders of the community. The Danish Law of 1683, promulgated by Christian V, placed Jews and gypsies in the same category, and Jews were allowed to enter Denmark only with a royal letter of protection. The Sephardic Jews--called Portuguese Jews--protested that they had obtained the right to free settlement twenty years earlier. These rights were confirmed, but four years later the Norwegian Law of Christian V had the same text as the Danish Law (Norway and Denmark were united).

In 1782 there were 1,830 Jews in Denmark, of those, 1,503 lived in Copenhagen. The 19th century brought cultural, social and economic progress for Danish Jewry, but there were some anti-Jewish polemics during the period 1813-19. Jews ultimately received citizenship in 1814, and the last restrictive legislation was abolished by the Danish Constitution of 1849. Conditions for Jews were poor in the beginning of that century, but by the end of it, most of the Jews belonged to the middle and upper classes. Names such as Goldschmidt, Nathanson, Brandes were well-known in painting and sculpture, and Balin and Niels Bohr in medicine and science. There were also some high-ranking officials among them. After the Kishinov pogrom of 1903, a large number of Jews, many of them artisans, settled in Denmark from Eastern Europe. During the period 1900-21 alone, the Jewish population increased from 4,200 to 6,000.

When World War II broke out, there were about 7,500 Jews in Denmark, including 1,700 refugees from Central Europe (Germany, Austria, Czechoslovakia). During the first three years of the German occupation, a policy of negotiation between Danes and Germans was more or less maintained, with the unusual result that the Jews remained unmolested. The situation changed however in August 1943 as a result of increasing Danish resistance. That September martial law was proclaimed, and persecution against Jews was begun in early October. The Jews had been warned about deportation by the German attaché for shipping affairs (a later ambassador in Denmark). These warnings spread quickly and overnight a rescue organization sprang up. Seven thousand Jews were aided in their flight to Sweden by fishing boats. The escape lasted for a period of three weeks and was accomplished with Swedish cooperation. Fewer than 500 Jews were seized in Denmark by the Germans.

(among them the chief rabbi Friediger), and sent to Theresienstadt, from where they were brought to Sweden in May 1945. About sixty-five perished in the camps (fifty of them in Theresienstadt) from natural causes. The total loss was 1-2%.

At the end of 1968 the Jewish population was about the same as before World War II, i.e. 6-7,000. During 1969 a further 1,500 refugees came from Poland. Today only 1% of Danish Jews are living outside Copenhagen, but 150 years ago there were several communities in Jutland.

The first congregation in Copenhagen was founded in 1684 by two Ashkenazi Jews. The first rabbi arrived three years later, and the first cemetery was established in 1694. Sephardic services were also maintained, but in private homes. By the 1730s, Jews were allowed to establish synagogues and a new synagogue was inaugurated in 1833 (the original one having burned down in 1795). This new synagogue was built on the initiative of the famous rabbi Abraham Wolff, the first rabbi in Denmark with an academic education. A few strictly orthodox members--dissatisfied with some innovations introduced into the new synagogue in Krystallgade--established services in accordance with Polish rites. These services were held in private homes during the period 1845-1955. After the building of the Krystallgade synagogue the former Sephardic prayer-rooms were abandoned. A more orthodox congregation (the Maheika Hadesch) was established in 1910 and still exists, maintaining their own synagogue but being at the same time members of the larger, conservative community--Det mosaiske Troessamfund. There is no Reform synagogue in Copenhagen, but a small Reform party existed during the first decades of the 19th century. Rabbi Wolff was succeeded by Professor Simonsen, the first native-born rabbi in Denmark. After the death of Rabbi Friediger in 1947, a new Danish-born rabbi, Marcus Melchior, was chosen. He was eager to maintain contact with the Danish Church, and was succeeded in 1969 by his son. In 1805 a day-school for boys was founded, and in 1810 one for girls. They were later united into one school, Carolineskolen, which has enjoyed increasing enrollment during these last years. (In the 1960s this school had about 140 pupils.)

Sweden

In May 1975 Swedish Jewry celebrated the bicentennial of its settlement in Sweden. The occasion was marked by a service including participation by many artistic performers and attended by the King in the Synagogue in Stockholm. The service was followed by a reception in the City Hall given by the City of Stockholm. Also in connection with this event there were exhibitions in the Royal Library and in the Stockholm City Museum.

Several regulations in 1685 directed against the presence of Jews seem to indicate that Jews have resided illegally in Sweden during certain periods of time. The first ordinance referred to Jews as "revilers of Christ and His communion" and justified their removal from the country in order to protect the pure Lutheran faith. Permission to stay was granted in exceptional cases only. A hundred years later--under the rule of Gustav III--the position of Jews in Sweden changed. Influenced by his mother--a sister of Friedrich II of Prussia--King Gustav adopted a new attitude towards Jews. In June 1774

Aron Isaac, a seal engraver from Mecklenburg, arrived in Stockholm. Eleven months later, on 2 May 1775, he received the King's permission to settle there with his brother, his partners and their families, a number sufficient to maintain a service. A year later the first cemetery was consecrated with royal permission, and in 1779 Jews were granted the right to settle in Stockholm, Gothenburg, Norrköping and shortly after at the naval station Karlskrona. Certain conditions were imposed but there existed a measure of religious freedom. The government's regulation about Jews (Judereglementet) in 1782 was modeled on those of other European countries, but was in certain respects more liberal. Jews could engage in industry and those trades that were not subject to guilds, but were, like all other non-Christians, excluded from holding government offices and were denied the right to vote. Inter-marriage also was prohibited. The financial crises after the Napoleonic wars led to anti-Semitic agitation, but influenced by economic liberalism, the regulation of 1782 was repealed in the spring of 1838--the year which marks the beginning of Jewish emancipation. Some months later, as a consequence of wide-spread opposition against the new decree which allowed Jews to settle anywhere, the government decided that foreign Jews would be permitted to reside only in the four cities mentioned above. This decree governed the civil rights of Jews.

During the period 1838-70 almost all barriers fell. In 1871 a community was founded in Malmö and Jewish activity increased. In the last 100 years, Swedish Jews have obtained respectable positions in cultural life --theatre, literature, painting, music--and in financial careers. In 1838 the total Jewish population was about 900 (800 of these living in Stockholm and Gothenburg); in 1880, 3,000 and, in 1930, 7,000 (about 4,000 in Stockholm). Before the beginning of World War II, about 3,000 refugees came to Sweden from Central Europe, and during the war Danish and Norwegian Jews also came, returning to Denmark and Norway in 1945. With the Bernadotte operations in the spring and summer of 1945 some 3,500 Jews arrived in Sweden from German camps, and many more arrived later. According to the 1961 census the total number of Jews was estimated at 13-14,000 (about 50% of them living in Stockholm) and about 1,500 have come from Poland since 1968.

The first rabbi arrived in Stockholm from Mecklenburg in 1780. About 60-70 years later the services were modeled on those of German Reform Jewry, as in Gothenburg, where the first synagogue was built in 1808. The psalms were chanted in Swedish--even the sermons were in Swedish! The liturgy was still in Hebrew but shortened and with Swedish prayers interpolated. The Gothenburg community was the first to introduce the organ into the synagogue. Famous rabbis in Stockholm were Gottlieb Klein, succeeded in 1914 by the Zionist and writer Marcus Ehrenpreis, who was followed by the scientist and researcher, Kurt Wilhelm. In addition to the Great Synagogue in Stockholm (which was inaugurated in 1870) there exist two smaller Orthodox synagogues. In Malmö the service is Orthodox (conservative) most of the members there being descendants of immigrants from Eastern Europe. In the new community of Borås (which was established after World War II) almost all are survivors of the Holocaust. After the war the question of special Jewish education became pressing, partly as a consequence of the many new-comers, and a day-school of eight classes was founded in Stockholm. Here even the tendencies in the Board of the Jewish community and among many members have become somewhat more conservative than before.

Finland

In Helsinki a Jewish high school, elementary school and a kindergarten have existed for sixty years. The two Jewish communities of Helsinki and Turku have always been conscious of Jewish tradition and devoted to Zionism. During the first fifty or sixty years of the 19th century the authorities tried to act against Jewish settlement and imposed severe restrictions, limiting the places of residence and the occupations open to Jews. During the 1870s and 1880s the debates of the press on Jewish emancipation continued. When a law of 1889 authorized the Jews to settle in Helsinki, Turku and Viipuri, about 1,000 Jews were resident in Finland. Today their number is approximately 1,750, of whom about 1,300 live in Helsinki. In 1909 a law was passed abolishing the restrictions, but the Russian government delayed its ratification, and Jews did not receive full civil rights until 1917 when Finland became independent. During World War II Finnish authorities, in spite of strong German pressure, refused to enforce anti-Jewish legislation. 160 Finnish Jews who did not have Finnish nationality found refuge in Sweden.

Norway

During the 17th and 18th centuries the Danish legislative enactments were also practiced in Norway. The Norwegian Law of King Christian V in 1687 incorporated the same enactments about Jews as the Danish Law--in spite of the protest of the Portuguese Jews. The authorities did not know of their special privileges. Norwegian legal documents tell us about people being arrested because they had no letter of protection. Among those documents are letters from 1666 belonging to Jews arrested in Copenhagen on their way to Norway from Hamburg. These letters, written in Yiddish, are very interesting from a cultural point of view. They are full of expressions indicating that the persons were influenced by the Shabbetai Zevi Messianic movement which had even reached Germany by autumn 1665. Only a few Jews settled in Norway; some others stayed there for just a short time. Those who definitely settled probably were or became baptized.

The year when the union with Denmark was broken also produced the Norwegian Constitution of 1814 which, though liberal in many ways, nevertheless introduced an absolute interdict against all kinds of Jews. No Jew could come to Norway, even with a letter of protection, and there were no exceptions for Portuguese Jews. However, many distressing incidents and financial needs brought the government in the 1830s to again permit letters of protection, and in 1844 Portuguese Jews were guaranteed free settlement.

In the meantime the famous Norwegian poet, Henrik Wergeland (1808-45), who occupies a unique place in the cultural history of Norway, had begun through newspaper articles his campaign against the interdict in the Norwegian Constitution--a constitution which he always praised except for the illiberal prohibition of Jewish immigration. In 1839 he submitted to the Storting (parliament) a detailed proposal to rescind this prohibition, emphasizing consideration of justice and reconciliation--the themes expressed in his popular work "Indlaeg i Jødesagen" ("Essays About the Jewish Question") of 1841. He spoke out against anti-Semitism, wrote about Jewish religion, nationality and patriotism, and told about the Jewish occupations, philanthropic activities and moral excellence. Although he did not disregard the

economic advantages which the admission of Jews would bring to Norway, moral considerations were of the highest importance to him. Christianity, justice and charity demanded that the prohibition should be rescinded. His collections of poetry, "Jøden" ("The Jew") of 1842 and "Jødinden" ("The Jewess") of 1844 contributed perhaps still more toward creating a favourable atmosphere. Many of the poems, which still appear in anthologies, --even for schools--have Jewish themes. Wergeland described the first parliamentary debate in 1842 about the proposal in his essay "Jødesagen i det norske Storting" ("The Jewish Cause in the Norwegian Parliament"). In that year there were fifty-one votes for the proposal and forty-three against. The case was taken up in the parliament again in 1845 and in 1848. Finally, in 1851, the proposal obtained the necessary 2/3 majority with ninety-three for and only ten against.

In his campaign for the Jews, Wergeland corresponded with prominent Jews in Sweden, Denmark and Schleswig-Holstein. After his death, Scandinavian Jews erected a memorial to Wergeland on his grave. It was unveiled in 1849 at a well-attended public ceremony and in the presence of three Swedish Jews who had come to Norway with letters of protection. On every 17th of May--the Norwegian national holiday, Independence Day,--Jews assemble at this monument, and the president of the Jewish Youth Club speaks and places a wreath on it.

The arguments against Jews were of different kinds: religious, economic, questions of their character and their trade. Some feared an invasion of Jews were they to be granted completely free entrance. When at last the interdict in the second paragraph of the Norwegian Constitution was abolished in June 1851, the law of 24 September guaranteed them almost all civil rights, and in later legislation most of the other restrictions were annulled. They received the right to be government officials, teachers and members of other professions. The dissenter-law of 1891 made it possible to found Jewish communities, and the law of 1969 dealing with religious communities even guaranteed financial support from the government and the municipalities to dissenter-communities and their religious schools. On the other hand, a law about slaughtering in 1929 made "shhita" (the Jewish method of butchering) impossible.

The fear--expressed in the parliamentary debates of the 1840s--of Jewish mass-immigration into Norway was baseless. The first two Jews who came to Norway after the new law of 1851 arrived in 1852 (we know the name of only one of them). In 1875 there were twenty-five Jewish inhabitants in the country, fifteen years later two hundred and fourteen, and, at the end of the century, six hundred and forty-two. Until 1880 most immigrants came from Germany and the German-Danish counties Schleswig-Holstein. After that time nearly all of them came from Eastern Europe (Russia, Poland and the Baltic provinces. Many of these settled in Sweden for some ten to twenty years before they brought their families to Norway. The first efforts to establish religious services and to form a community were made in Oslo (Christiania) in the 1880s, and in Trondheim from the beginning of the 1890s. Jews in Oslo, however, had bought ground for a Jewish cemetery as early as 1869. The Mosaic Community of Oslo was established in 1892, and in Trondheim in 1905. Both of these still exist. The present synagogue in Oslo--in Bergstien Street--was inaugurated in 1920, and the one in Trondheim--probably the most northern synagogue in the world--in 1925. The services are orthodox, but in

many ways follow what the Americans would call a conservative rite.

I estimate the number of Jews in Norway on 9 April 1940 (the day when the Germans attacked Denmark and Norway) to be about 1,800 including 250-300 refugees from Central European Countries. In May 1940 the Jews had to relinquish their radios, and the police ordered the communities in Oslo and Trondheim and other Jewish organizations to deliver lists of their members to the Germans. This order was renewed the following spring, but this time only the numbers and not the names were listed. Through the registration in February 1942 made by the Quisling authorities, all Jews had a J stamped in their identity cards, and by this registration the police obtained a quite accurate count of Norwegian Jews. In the days just prior to the German attack on the Soviet Union nearly all Jewish men in northern Norway were arrested. The same thing happened in southern Norway to all Jews without any citizenship, but there they were liberated after two or three weeks. During the winter of 1941-42 the Jewish firms in Trondheim were seized and many of the owners arrested. The remaining Jewish men in Trondheim were arrested on 6 October 1942, during the state of emergency which prevailed at this time in that part of the country (Trøndelag). In other places Jews were also arrested during the same spring and summer, among them the Oslo rabbi, and in August-September ten other Jews were taken.

Anti-semitic propaganda was increasing, and during October-November the Quisling government issued laws against Jews, partly on German initiative. On 24 October a law was passed making the arrest of Jews legal, and two days later all Jewish men were seized. On the same day, 26 October, another law was passed making it legal to confiscate all Jewish property, and, according to a law of 17 November, all Jews were required to report to the authorities. The bishops of the Norwegian Church and other religious institutions sent a letter of protest to Quisling on 11 November in which they stated that God does not differentiate among peoples, and, since the Lutheran religion is the state religion, the state cannot enact a law which is in conflict with Christian tenets or the dogma of the Church. This letter was read out in many churches the following Sunday. The Quislings responded by publishing anti-Jewish declarations of Martin Luther in the newspapers. In late October all Jewish men whom the police were able to apprehend were brought into camps. A month later women were arrested and deportation started. On 26 November the vessel Donau left Oslo with 530 Jews on board--men, women, the aged, children and infants--and three months later a second ship, the Götenland embarked carrying 158 deportees.

In all, 760 Jews were deported from Norway, nearly all of them to Auschwitz. Of these, only twenty-five survived. Another twenty-two Jews lost their lives by execution and other ways. A total of 757 Jews became victims of German tyranny--nearly 43% of the Jewish population. About one hundred survived in Norway, sixty of them (in "mixed marriages") in camps, while 925 escaped to Sweden with the assistance of different groups in the Norwegian Resistance movement. For the first time during the German occupation there was a problem of mass-escape. New so-called "export-organizations" grew up, and they later continued their work helping other groups and single persons to escape over the border.

Jewish communities were dissolved and their property confiscated. In Trondheim the synagogue had been occupied by German military forces since

Easter 1941, and the interior was destroyed. The nazi authorities threatened to efface the cemetery in Trondheim in order to build houses on it. This would have been effected if the war had continued for another two or three months.

During the first two or three years after the war it was difficult to maintain Jewish religious and cultural life. Another problem was to replace the deported rabbis and cantors, especially in the Trondheim community. The reconstruction of the Oslo community took place immediately after 8 May 1945 and Trondheim followed in July. The number of widows had increased, and the age-distribution of the Jewish population was abnormal. In Oslo the synagogue in Bergstien was re-opened the same summer (1945), while the Trondheim synagogue was re-inaugurated in October 1947. The Norwegian government permitted 600 Jews from camps for displaced persons to enter Norway to replace those who had been deported. In May 1947, 400 Jews came from camps in Germany and during the following eighteen months a further 150 arrived. About the same number left Norway in June 1949 for Israel, and others emigrated during the Korean War in the '50s. After 1950 Norway was one of the first countries to accept so-called "hard core" persons. About 100 Jews belonging to this category have settled in Norway.

I estimate the number of Jews in Norway in 1975 to be between 1,000 and 1,100. About 850 of them (men, women and children) are members of the communities in Oslo and Trondheim. Before the war the number of cultural personalities was rather low. Many Jews were employed in trade, some in industry, some were physicians and barristers. Since the war the number of Jewish shops has diminished considerably and more Jews are employed in industry, private enterprises, government and public service, and in academic professions at the universities.

Sources

Encyclopaedia Judaica articles: "Denmark", "Finland", "Norway", "Sweden".
Hartwig, Michael: Jøderne i Danmark i tiden 1600-1800.
Mendelsohn, Oskar: Jødenes historie i Norge gjennom 300 ar.
Valentin, Hugo: Juderne i Sverige.
"Ved 150 Aarsdagen for Anordningen af 29. Marts 1814."

